IDEAS ON LIBERTY

MAY, 1955 SERIES I

How To Get Action	Leonard E. Read	1
Lincoln Didn't Say It	Staff	6
A Decree Of Racial Inferiority	F. A. Harper	8
Education For Privacy	Marten ten Hoor	10
The Revolution At Ramah	Frank Chodorov	25
Equal Rights	Carl Schurz	29
The Conscription Idea	Dean Russell	32
In An Ideal America	Staff	46
Imperial Chinese Welfare State	M. Huc	47
Religion In American Life	Ben Moreell	52
Freedom In Transactions	Frederic Bastiat	63
The Farm Problem	M. H. Banner	65
More Machines Mean More Jobs	Benj. F. Fairless	70
Loyalty Oaths	Staff	77
Who Is A Libertarian?	Staff	80
Inequality Of Wealth	Ludwig von Mises	83
Causes of Depression	Bettina Bien	89
What Determines Prices?	Staff	93
Competition	William Johnson	94

THE FOUNDATION FOR ECONOMIC EDUCATION, INC.

Irvington-on-Hudson, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IDEAS ON LIBERTY

SERIES 1

50¢ a copy, 3 for $1.00 Postpaid

The following articles in this issue are available in pamphlet or leaflet form, and may be ordered in any quantity at a price which is designed to cover the actual costs of printing, handling, and postage:

EDUCATION FOR PRIVACY
IN AN IDEAL AMERICA
RELIGION IN AMERICAN LIFE
MORE MACHINES MEAN MORE JOBS.

Any other article will be reprinted in pamphlet or leaflet form if there is sufficient demand for it.

Permission is hereby granted to anyone to reprint any article in whole or in part (providing the customary credits are given), except the following for which such permission should be secured from the original publisher: EDUCATION FOR PRIVACY.

Copyright 1955 by the
Foundation for Economic Education

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How To Get Action

Leonard E. Read

"I WANT less talk and more action."

Thus speak Americans when they suddenly awaken to the fact that their liberties are endangered. Talk, they say, is useless; only action counts. But perhaps talk and action aren't necessarily opposites. What if studying, talking, writing, and explaining should turn out to be the only worth-while action there is? What then?

There are only two types of action: physical and intellectual. Do those who would save liberty advocate physical action? If so, how? To use physical force against others, except defensively, is to destroy the liberty of others which, by definition, is not liberty. To adopt this tactic — to employ physical force against others in any form or degree, except in self-defense — would be merely to substitute a new form of compulsion for the existing forms of compulsion, trading violence for violence — revolution! At best, it is the court of last resort and is not, really, what most persons have in mind when they insist they want action. Most of them mean only that they want "something done," and quickly! They want to fight peacefully. The thought of using fists or guns never as much as enters their heads; they reject physical action, in their calculations, by not even contemplating it. Thus, according to their own thesis, nothing logically remains but intellectual action.

How, then, does one fight for liberty intellectually? The best thing to do even in an intellectual fight for liberty, many think, is to organize — which is a form of action. Usually they think in terms of organizing someone else to do something instead of organizing their own time and energies. This damaging tactic is employed as though organizing had the power, somehow, to absolve individuals from doing any more than joining some organization. This mania for organizing is usually little more than an effort, doubtless unwitting, to transfer responsibility from oneself to some other person or persons whose competence is often unknown.

RESPONSIBILITY and authority always go hand in hand. Thus, if this process of organizing succeeds, authority over one's own actions is lost precisely in the degree that re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsibility is shifted to someone else. The citizen who "wants action," and resorts to this type of tactic, ends up further from his goal than ever. In fact, organizing, more often than not, is merely an attempt to "pass the buck." Yet, oddly enough, the mere act seems to have the strange power of conferring a sense of accomplishment on the ones who organize.

Organization, though much used, seems to be little understood. In the field of extending individual liberty, organization has strictly limited, technical possibilities. Unless these limitations are scrupulously observed, organization will inflict on liberty more harm than good; thwart, not abet, the spread of understanding. Sobering is the thought that if there were no organization, there could be no socialism!

In committee-type organizations, it is customary for persons to speak and act as a collective — as resolutioners in unison — instead of as persons. The best that these synthetic arrangements of individuals can produce is the lowest common denominator view of the majority. Such a view is almost certain to be different from, and inferior to, the best thought of the individuals who go to compose the arrangement. Yet the best is none too good when it comes to a working knowledge of liberty.

ORGANIZATIONS CAN, however, serve a highly useful purpose in developing and spreading an understanding of liberty if organization is confined to its proper sphere. For the purpose of advancing liberty, which depends solely on the advancement of individual understanding, the only usefulness of organization would seem to be to accommodate and to make easier the joint contribution to, participation in, and ownership of the physical assets that will aid in the process. These physical assets may include typewriters, buildings, specialized libraries, printing presses, telephones, and the many other tools helpful to individuals who are attempting to extend their understanding of liberty. These physical accommodations can enable searchers for truth to exchange and disseminate ideas and knowledge more effectively. They can be used to secure the advantages which derive from specialization or division of labor. Organization, limited to this form of voluntary cooperation, is a useful and efficient means for achieving these desirable ends.

Organization, however, like government, if extended beyond its proper sphere, becomes positively harmful to the original purpose. This fact constitutes the need for much careful thought on organizational limitation. Just as government becomes dangerous when its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coercive, restrictive, and destructive powers are extended into the creative areas, so do voluntary organizations pervert and destroy the benefits of intellect when the capacity to merge is carried to the point of subjecting individual judgments to the will of the majority or group. Truth, as each person sees it, is the best that the mind of man has to offer. Its distortion, inevitable when achieving a collective chorus, does injury to understanding.

If organization is not the best way to secure liberty, then what is? My answer — self-improvement — is the essence of simplicity. The reasons which lie behind the answer, however, are not so simple.

The inclination to escape personal responsibility — plus the belief that somehow intellectual miracles can be wrought by us on someone else — is too pervasive for easy rejection. Unless we fully understand that these inclinations and beliefs are wholly without merit, we will continue to indulge in them. I wish to make the argument that self-improvement is the only practical course to liberty.

Is there one book or one article written by anyone at any time that can be designated as the final word on liberty? Perhaps the best that can be said is that the finest minds of all time have been in pursuit of its understanding and that now and then a tiny ray of new light has been thrown on what theretofore was darkness and lack of understanding. These few most advanced searchers have been among the first to say, "The more exploration I do, the more I find there is to learn."

The reason for this difficulty in understanding liberty is that liberty, like truth, is an object of infinite pursuit, a quest without end, ever! The understanding of liberty requires intellectual ventures into the areas of the unknown or, more likely, into the areas that have become unknown or that majorities have declared taboo. Have you not noticed the vigor we employ when a present liberty is threatened and then, when it is lost, how soon we refer to it as a "social gain"? How can one who has been thus trapped, or who himself has lapsed into thinking of a new restraint as a "social gain," possibly identify the liberties he has lost?

Every individual ought to realize that he has not mastered the subject of liberty until he thoroughly understands, and can competently explain, this idea: With government properly limited to its legitimate functions of defense, our problems of interdependence can be resolved through voluntary effort, and only through voluntary effort. If that is a correct appraisal, then most persons are inexpert in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their understanding of this subject.

In brief, not a single person among us is justified in regarding himself other than as a student of liberty. No know-it-all exists or ever will.

In searching for a student of liberty, the search must be within one's self. In the world of persons, it is only within each of us that the fertile, explorable areas exist. The best explorer of oneself is oneself. It is not possible to impart to others that which we do not possess. And even after we have made some progress in understanding, the most we can do for others is to make known to them a willingness to share what we have discovered by our own thinking, or what we find edifying from recorded thinking. Whether or not what we offer is, in fact, shared, is beyond our power; and we should realize this.

It is conceded that the student attitude, this search within ourselves, may at times appear unrewarding. But if the understanding of liberty is to be advanced, the attempt must be persisted in, regardless of its seeming extravagance in time and effort.

Along this line, a fictional statement ascribed to Christ is heartening if one will think of Him in the symbolic terms of truth and infinite goodness, and of our own weakness and inabilities as weeds and brambles; and of our own rare virtues and abilities as fertile ground:

"Presently the Master appeared on the steps of the Synagogue and began to speak. It was immediately obvious that he had been aware of the rudeness of the crowd — and deplored it. He had been appointed, he said, to offer a way of salvation to the world; and that meant everybody. In a task so great as this, no prudent thought could be taken about the cost of it or the waste of it. His mission, he said, was to sow the seed of good will among men in the hope of an eventual harvest of peace. Much of this seed would be squandered. Some of it would fall among weeds and brambles where it would have no chance at all to grow, but the sower could not pause or look back to lament this extravagance. Some of the seed would fall upon stony ground where there was very little soil to nourish it and the tender plants would soon wither and die; but the sower must not be dismayed. Some of the life-giving grain would grow! Some of it would find friendly lodging in fertile ground!" (Lloyd C. Douglas, *The Big Fisherman,* Houghton Mifflin, 1948, p. 377.)

Action? The casual thinker might imagine that the best course

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to try to tell others what to do and how to think. But reason supplies a contrary answer. It suggests that pursuit of one's own personal understanding is the only practical action for one to take. If a person advances his own understanding of the true and the false, the understanding thus acquired will be sought by others. Reason recommends that a person get the horse before the cart; that first one must learn; that influencing others will take care of itself. Reason says that influence in the creative areas can have no effectiveness prior to learning; that learning has no end.

SOME PERSONS will assert that the conclusions herein set forth are self-evident, but will argue that this suggested student approach — this process of self-improvement — is too slow to meet the challenge of these times.

I am in no position to deny this. But, in my opinion, there is no short cut. The only way to truth — that is, to understanding — is through one's own person. When we gain an appreciation of this simple fact, we will be on our way to as little violence against persons, and thus to as much liberty among persons, as is within our power to bring about.

ACTION? For authoritarians it is physical force. For libertarians it is first understanding and then explanation — the latter being "talk," either verbal or written.

Leonard E. Read is president of the Foundation for Economic Education.

From time to time, readers urge upon me the espousal of some program they are pleased to call "constructive." Each of the proposed reforms usually has something to commend it, while the sincerity of the proponents makes one wish that they might succeed. The fact remains, however, that the reform invariably rests its case on the goodwill, intelligence, and selflessness of men who, invested with the power to do so, will put the reform into operation. And the lesson of history is that power is never so used. Never. I am convinced, on the other hand, that all of the evils of which these honest people complain can be traced to the misuse of power, and am therefore inclined to distrust political power of any kind. The only "constructive" idea that I can in all conscience advance, then, is that the individual put his trust in himself, not in power; that he seek to better his understanding and lift his values to a higher and still higher level; that he assume responsibility for his behavior and not shift his responsibility to committees, organizations and, above all, a superpersonal State. Such reforms as are necessary will come of themselves when, or if, men act as intelligent and responsible human beings. There cannot be a "good" society until there are "good" men. FRANK CHODOROV, 1949

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln Didn't Say It

Dean Russell

NEXT TO Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln is probably the most quoted — and quotable — President we ever had. And as is the case with all famous persons, Lincoln is sometimes credited with words he didn't utter. Probably the most famous example is this:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative.
10. You cannot really help men by having the government tax them to do for them what they can and should do for themselves.

Lincoln didn't say that — at least, not in those exact words. The author is William J. H. Boetcker, a retired Presbyterian minister. Yet the words were credited to Lincoln in a national magazine, in the *Congressional Record,* and in many house organs, newspapers, and radio programs.

THE CONFUSION began when an excellent quotation on property by Lincoln was printed on one side of a leaflet which contained the above 10 points, *unsigned,* on the other side. Several prominent persons who received the leaflet jumped to the conclusion that Lincoln was the author of both quotations, and they said so. As a result, we will probably continue to read this "Lincoln quotation" in various places and from time to time.

Many of us are overly impressed by *whose name* is actually signed to a statement rather than by *what* the statement says. Because of this, unfortunately, there will probably be some who will tend to discount the merit of these 10 principles when they find that they were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phrased by a comparatively unknown minister rather than by Abraham Lincoln. If so, they should know that Lincoln certainly endorsed these same general ideas in different words. There is no doubt that they represent his fundamental beliefs.

FOR EXAMPLE, here is Lincoln himself along the same line:

"Property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently to build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence . . . I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good."

CONFUSED SOCIALISTS

Socialism, like the ancient idea from which it springs, confuses the distinction between government and society. As a result of this, every time we object to a thing being done by government, the socialists conclude that we object to its being done at all. We disapprove of state education. Then the socialists say that we are opposed to any education. We object to a state religion. Then the socialists say that we want no religion at all. We object to a state-enforced equality. Then they say that we are against equality. And so on, and so on. It is as if the socialists were to accuse us of not wanting persons to eat because we do not want the state to raise grain. FREDERIC BASTIAT, "The Law" 1850

AUTOMATION

I do not know of a single, solitary instance where a great technological gain has taken place in the United States of America that it has actually thrown people out of work. I do not know of it — I am not aware of it — because the industrial revolution that has taken place in the United States in the past 25 years has brought into the employment field an additional 20 million people. PHILIP MURRAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Decree Of Racial Inferiority

F. A. Harper

THE DECISION of the Supreme Court on the issue of segregation in the public schools is commonly being heralded as a body blow at racial discrimination. One not a lawyer should hardly presume to question a legal decision of the Supreme Court, especially when it is a decision unanimous among that learned body. But on another basis — an extra-legal basis — an interesting question may be raised about the reasons given in support of the legal decision.

In forcing Negroes and Whites to be schooled together, the issue was not whether they shall be schooled at public expense. Nor was it whether both shall receive equal facilities so far as teachers and books and buildings and playgrounds and all that are concerned. Equality in these respects was not the issue. The issue was, instead, whether equality in all these respects insures "equal educational opportunities" for Negroes.

ACCORDING to the Supreme Court opinion, the presence of the Whites is necessary before the Negroes can attain equal access to school learning. For the Court has said that "segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprives the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities. . . . 'Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children.'"

IS NOT this opinion clearly discriminatory against the Negro race? It is, beyond question, based on the idea that the exclusive company of Negroes in school is somehow lacking in educational opportunity. If the nine Supreme Court Justices did not themselves each believe that Whites are superior to Negroes, surely they would not have supported the opinion which says, in effect, that Whites *are* superior to Negroes. If they believed otherwise, surely they would not have decreed that Negroes are denied "equal educational opportunities" unless they have the constant association of Whites in school. According to the Supreme Court Justices, segregation has a detrimental effect only on colored children,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not on both colored and white children equally nor on Whites alone.

What could be more discriminatory than such an opinion?

If I were a Negro, I suspect I might resent the implied inferiority of Negroes contained in this opinion.

F. A. Harper is a member of the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education.

IT'S THE UTILITY THAT COUNTS

Every time a customer makes a purchase in a free economy, he is also forced to make a decision. For since he cannot afford to buy all the goods and services offered to him, he must select between them.

This process of selection is complicated because it involves the customer's personal needs and wants, his supply of each article, as well as the prices asked. For example, there is no want today for high-buttoned shoes, no need for buggy whips; prices of two dollars a loaf would drastically curtail the sale of bread; and a man with a supply of eight automobile tires for one car would hardly buy a ninth, regardless of price. To describe all these factors that enter into a decision to buy, economists use the word utility, which means the additional satisfaction that a person realizes — or hopes to realize — from some particular service or commodity as compared with others that may be available to him.

In a dictatorship, utility has relatively minor economic significance. People may be forced to buy bread at two dollars a loaf or high-buttoned shoes, even if they don't want them. But in a free economy, the utility of any commodity or service largely determines its fate in the market place. If it has utility for the consumer, it will be sold. If not, the company producing it will be forced to change or to go out of business.

This is more important than it may first appear. For it not only provides for the gratification of individual desires, but it also pushes producers into making better and better goods at more favorable prices. In a dictatorship, the economy can stagnate and become outmoded; but in a free nation, the continuing pressure of what the economist calls utility leads to constant improvements and progress. It is this factor, perhaps more than anything else, that has led to America's dominance as a world economic power.
MELLON BANK NOTES, No. 7

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Education For Privacy

Marten ten Hoor

In view of the hundreds of conferences which have been held on liberal education, it would seem to be impossible to say anything new on the subject. Since there seems to be nothing new to say, one must, in order to be original, be contrary, eccentric, or partisan. I have chosen to be partisan. The proposition to be defended is, frankly, a half-truth. If it can be established, there will be some cause for satisfaction; for the establishment of a half-truth is not a bad average in this complex and confused world. There is the justification, moreover, that the other, and possibly the better, half has in our day had practically all of the attention.

Stated concretely, the proposition is this: Never in the history of the world have there been so many people occupied with the improvement of so few. To sharpen the point by a specific example: Never have there been so many people making a good living by showing the other fellow how to make a better one. If you are skeptical, I recommend that you try this exercise — add up, as of the current date, the social workers, planners, and reformers; the college presidents, deans, and professors; the editors of magazines, journals, and newspapers (not forgetting college newspapers); almost everybody in Washington, D. C., during recent years; and the tens of thousands of miscellaneous social-minded folks who attend conferences, workshops, and institutes organized for the improvement of the human race. Subtract that figure from the total population of this country, and compare this figure with a corresponding figure for, say, the year 1900.

You will then see what I mean when I say that this is the era of undiscriminating allegiance to good causes. To come nearer home, compute the sum of all college and university presidents, deans, and professors who have in the last five years attended meetings devoted to the improvement of education. Compare that figure with the number of those who remained on the campus working, and you will find proof even *in academia*.

As further evidence, and as a striking symptom, there is the re-

This article was first printed in *The American Scholar*, Winter 1953-54.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent popularity of educational surveys. Most states and many institutions have experienced several. I have lived through eleven, without noticeable improvement in myself or my neighbors. Note the procedure and the technique, for there you will find the moral. The surveyors are always from another state or another institution. This is in accordance with the well-known principle that an expert is an ordinary person who is away from home. These outsiders are brought in because of their objectivity, objectivity being the capacity for discovering faults abroad which you cannot recognize at home. To be a good educational surveyor — or any kind of social analyst, for that matter — you must have a sharp eye for foreign motes but a dull one for domestic beams. You must be a contented extrovert, so that, after diagnosing the faults of others, you can continue to live in perfect comfort with your own.

I MUST CONFESS that I view all this indiscriminate altruism with a jaundiced eye. It does seem to me that these days there are too many leaders and too few followers; too many preachers and too few sinners — self-conscious sinners, that is. If this were an illustrated article, I would insert at this point a wonderful cartoon I saw not long ago. A little boy was asking an obviously astounded and embarrassed father, "But if we're here to help others, what are the others here for?" Nobody has time these days to improve himself, so busy is he with attempts to improve his neighbor. There is something wrong with that equation. It seems to me that it is time to try to balance it. I suggest that this can be done by shifting some weight from one side to the other, by shifting the emphasis from social improvement to self-improvement. I suggest that over the door of every academic cubicle there should hang the sign which Thoreau had over the door of his hut: "*My* destiny mended here, not yours." In short, I propose to make a plea for *education for privacy*.

BEFORE UNDERTAKING to identify some of the elements of this type of education, I should like to offer some justification of my skepticism concerning the present emphasis on social-mindedness in education. To begin with, it is so easy to assume that your neighbor is much worse off than yourself. The universality of this tendency is undoubtedly accounted for psychologically by its attractive by-products. The assumption produces a feeling of comfort. If there is some slight suspicion that all is not well within, it is compensating to concentrate on the plight of one's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neighbor. Since attention to him is distracting, it keeps the individual from worrying about himself. To do something about a neighbor's ignorance also makes one feel virtuous. This absorbing concern for the improvement of one's neighbor is undoubtedly a product of civilization. It is doubtful if primitive man worried much about it. The cannibal, in fact, represents the other extreme: He uses his neighbor solely for his own improvement.

IN THE SECOND PLACE, I doubt if the reformer always has the wisdom necessary to direct the lives of so many people — but this is certainly assumed. How many people are there who have demonstrated the capacity to prescribe for others? If an individual makes a mistake in trying to improve himself, this is not so serious; but consider the consequences if he has induced all his neighbors to do the same thing. History is filled with examples of self-confident leaders who led their followers straight to a common catastrophe. The fact is that we still know so little about human personality in the concrete. To be sure, there are excellent textbook pictures, with revealing analytical tables and graphs. But this is personality in the abstract. Any physician will tell you that he rarely finds a textbook picture in a patient. Not only is every human being a complex with variations, but there are the environment in which that complex functions and the accidental circumstances which confuse the vision and disrupt life.

Nor has the reformer too much reason for assuming that he has discerned the good life for his neighbors. Let us take as a familiar example the characteristic projection by parents into the lives of their children. This is something we can readily understand and, because it is suffused with parental affection, forgive. But how many parents are there who realize that each child is to some extent a new complex of elements and who can bring themselves to substitute that confounding reality for the fond subjective creation? Too often the recommendation of a way of life is nothing more than the advocacy of a personal preference.

From subjectivism in this sense of the term there is no complete escape. Even leadership is personalized in an individual. Hitler was an individual: He spun his fantastic and criminal notions out of his own warped private personality. It is, therefore, terribly important that everything shall be right in the reformer before he undertakes to reform others. "Nobody," says a character in Norman Douglas' *South Wind*, "has the right to call himself well disposed towards so-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciety until he has grasped the elementary fact that the only way to improve society is to improve oneself." And may I suggest in this connection that a major in the social sciences does not automatically qualify a student for social leadership?

FURTHER REASON for doubt is to be found in the characteristic reactions of the hypersocial-minded. They become so indignant when people resist their ministrations. They are so determinedly selfish in their unselfishness. Ideas, particularly ideas designed for the improvement of others, so quickly become inflated. In extreme cases they devour themselves. How antagonistic even educators become over professional differences as to how the ignorant should be rendered less so! Note the bitterness between rival reform groups. Let us not forget that human beings have killed one another in the mass even on the authority of their religions. Note how political leaders fall out, quarrel, conspire, injure one another in their unselfish efforts to save the country. In the absence of sophistication and modesty, reform notions grow into delusions; their advocates become more and more autocratic; leadership becomes pathological; the desire to help one's fellow men is transformed into fanaticism and tyranny — and societies become authoritarian.

Here lies the explanation of the tendency of hypersocial-mindedness to suppress individualism and to produce too much uniformity. There are good reasons for doubting the wisdom of this lack of interest in the individual as a unique personality. There is, to begin with, the obvious and inescapable fact that everybody is an individual. The higher the scale of life, the more individuals differ and the greater their potentialities for differing. Society must make provision for individual differences.

Authoritarianisms of the type of national socialism and communism are primitivistic; for they propose to turn back the course of social change and to establish societies in which individuals shall have a status more closely resembling that of ants, bees, or even of atoms or electrons than of human personalities. They have forgotten, or propose to ignore, the incontrovertible fact that the great works of art, literature, music, philosophy, religion, and science — that is, the world's great manifestations of excellence and leadership — were the products of intensely individual persons. Indeed, some of the world's great geniuses have been self-centered, unsocial and iconoclastic, with little or no interest in the improvement of their fellow men.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But society can well afford that. A regimented society will not only suppress and possibly ultimately breed out these "exaggerated" individuals, but will generally discourage the manifestations of the adventurous and original spirit. Government and education designed to do this will bring about a tragic cultural impoverishment in human life; for individual differences enrich life, they stimulate the intelligence and the imagination, and they invite comparison and criticism. They keep the individual alive *as an individual,* and not merely as a bearer of the racial genius or a servant of the state.

It is true that modern life requires a certain amount of regimentation. Individuals obviously cannot be permitted to run amuck. At least the great majority of persons must adapt themselves to other persons. Mechanical contrivances, such as traffic lights, must replace individual judgment; laws are to some extent substitutes for individual choice. But let us not forget that it is not the basic purpose of these substitutes to repress individuality, but rather to make possible a more general and richer realization of individuality. It is not the purpose of social organization to reduce man to the subhuman, but to create more favorable opportunities for the realization of what is uniquely human.

The need of complex societies for a high degree of organization is one reason why so much attention is focused on the improvement of the other fellow. Especially in a democracy, where everyone is more or less free to advocate schemes for the improvement of society, lively and self-confident minds are inclined to expend their intellectual and emotional potential on reform movements. The attention of the reformer is consequently drawn away from contemplation of the state of his own soul. Since he is so happily exercised in improving others, the habit of self-examination gradually atrophies. How then can he be sure that he is the right person to prescribe for his neighbors? Should he not stop now and then to take an inventory of his resources? Does he in fact have these resources? It is because I have serious doubts of this sort, and because of the increasing neglect in education of attention to the accumulation of these resources, that I feel it time to make a plea for education for privacy.

What now are the essential elements of this education for privacy? In speaking of elements it is, of course, implied that the ideal construct of these elements constitutes an organized whole, a person-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ality. It is this ideal at which we aim, though we know full well that in any concrete individual, no matter how well educated after the formula which we shall propose, one or the other desirable characteristic is certain to be under- or over-emphasized.

The first requirement, clearly, is to learn how to think — not out loud or in print, but privately. The thinker himself, not his neighbor, is to be the beneficiary. To think does not mean to spend hours in idle daydreaming or in vagrant imaginings, or to make occasional impulsive sallies at ideas which happen to appear before the attention. The reference is certainly not to the semi-somnolent and comfortable ruminations which go on in the wandering mind of an inattentive student in the classroom. What is meant is systematic reflection, the constant purpose of which is to bring order out of the multiplicity and variety of things in which the human being is immersed.

To be sure, many people go through life with their senses alert, observing and savoring in generous measure the richness of the world about them. But what they experience they retain only in the form of materials for recollection. The mind gradually accumulates a rich inventory of goods, which can be brought out on display when there is social opportunity for it. But the relationship of these resources in the mind is one of mere contiguity, like that of goods in a department store. Experience has not resulted in an overall understanding because it has not been systematically thought about. Such individuals

> . . . see all sights from pole to pole,
> And glance, and nod, and bustle by,
> And never once possess (their) soul
> Before (they) die.

To possess one's soul in an intellectual sense means to have found some answer, or partial answer, to the questions: What is the nature of this world in which I find myself, what is my place in it, and what must be my attitude toward it? The problem is one of intellectual and spiritual orientation.

The benefits of such intellectual and spiritual adaption have been extolled by the wise men of all ages and all countries. A "view of life" prepares us for what life brings us, for what happens to us in our physical environment, and most important of all, for what people turn out to be and for what they do. To be spiritually and intellectually lost in the world, on the contrary, is to be unarmed and helpless.

A disorganized mind is unpre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pared for reality and easily frustrated. The fate that awaits the individual so afflicted is to be always a stranger and a wanderer in the world. The "lost soul" of literature, the ultimate in tragic creation, suffers from this great spiritual illness.

It may be unfortunate, but it is a fact that the sharper and livelier the intelligence and the more sensitive the spirit, the more serious the danger of disorientation. The simple-minded find life simple. Plants find themselves easy to live with, no doubt; for it cannot be difficult to vegetate successfully. It is not likely that the cow's ruminations are philosophical.

Man, for better or worse, is a rational animal. The more he thinks, the greater the need of organization among his ideas. The more subjects a student studies in college, the more extensive the potential disorder of his mind. It is not surprising that the scholarly mind, lost in a Babel of learning, seeks escape into a clearly defined specialty, and the practical mind, as soon as its owner has permission, into the comforts of a business, a profession, or domesticity. To be sure, we must integrate the curriculum. But what good is this if the professor's mind remains perched on its gaunt pinnacle or secluded in the laboratory?

The systematic way to the attainment of the organization of ideas is through philosophy and religion. It is true that the great intellectual constructions of the metaphysicians are not available to all men, and that even to the initiated they sometimes offer but poor comfort. Moreover, all of us have known individuals of great simplicity and humbleness of mind, quite untutored in dialectic, who somehow and in the simplest terms have securely located themselves in the cosmos.

Especially in the realm of religious experience do we find examples of this. The spirit seems to have found peace in terms of some all-embracing conviction or great renunciation. But this is not often possible for the inquisitive and analytical mind.

To CAST all burdens upon the Lord in one grand resolve sometimes implies ignorance of the nature of those burdens. There is only consciousness of their oppressive weight, but no understanding of their nature or causes. To be sure, the critical intelligence may also come ultimately to make this renunciation; but it will not feel justified in doing so until it has reflected upon causes and relationships and seen the problem of human trouble and sorrow *whole*. The solution must be a conquest, not an escape.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR THIS, the mind certainly needs philosophy, sacred or secular. No learned profession, however, can offer the inquiring mind an official formula which every man need only apply in order to be permanently on understanding terms with the world. To be sure, there are systems of metaphysics, sacred and secular, from which the troubled spirit can choose a ready-made synthesis. But this does not make the chosen system of ideas an integral part of the inner personality. Intellectual orientation to the world must be something more than an acquisition; it must be an organic growth. The student should by all means seek out the great religious and philosophical thinkers, study their systems, and add their insights to his own. But in the last analysis he must work out his own solution, for such a solution must be the end product of his *own* reflection in the context of his *own* experience. Only through the alchemy of private reflection do philosophical ideas become private resources.

ONLY THEN will they be available in time of crisis. When the normal course of existence is interrupted by conflict and frustration, it is a bit late to begin developing fundamental guiding ideas; that is the time to apply them.

A dramatic example of the saving grace of such resources is related by Admiral Byrd in his book on his expedition to the South Pole, entitled *Alone*. He had been left behind by the expedition in a dugout located several feet below the surface of the icecap. From this he periodically emerged through a vertical tunnel to make scientific observations. It happened that the heater in his subterranean shelter developed a leak of which he was not aware. Before he realized it, he had been dangerously poisoned, and he became seriously ill. During his convalescence he found himself struggling to overcome not only the physical damage done to his body, but also a deep spiritual depression, an obstinate conviction of the meaninglessness of life, which threatened to overwhelm him. There was no physician or psychoanalyst or cleric available. His fellow-explorers would not return for months. He was absolutely *alone*. He had to guide himself out of this slough of despair. This he did, after many agonizing days, by steady thinking, by "digging down into" his intellectual resources. And it was then, to use his own homely but vivid phrase, that he "uncovered the pay-dirt of philosophy." He did not then collect the materials of his readjustment; he used them to recover his sanity. In this crisis, what would he have done without these resources?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUT PERIODS of crisis are not the only times when man needs an orderly mind. If a ship is to hold its course, it needs a steady helm in good weather as well as in bad. I hasten to remark that this figure of speech has serious limitations, for a navigator has his chart prepared when he begins his voyage. Man, on the contrary, is faced with the problem of making a chart as he goes along. As a matter of fact, the plan of life is, for every man to some extent, an unconscious precipitate of his experience. We are not completely free agents; compulsion and fate, in the form of the physical world, our fellow men and social institutions, push the individual this way and that. What happens to him and what he becomes are clearly the result of a complex of inner and outer compulsions, over many of which he has no control.

WE ARE NOT here primarily concerned with action, however, but with interpretation. In philosophical reflection, the individual to some extent plays the part of the Greek chorus. He observes himself as actor in a cosmic setting. If he does so systematically, he will gradually discern not only his own role, but the direction of the whole drama. Only when he understands the meaning of the play can he orient himself in it. Such an understanding, vague and incomplete though it may be, will enable him to achieve his own view of life. If he is so fortunate as to see (what seems to him) the truth and to see it whole, he will thenceforth have a vision of the future as well as an understanding of the present and the past. If a rational man does not do that, why should he consider himself the crown of creation? If he does accomplish this, he can exult with the poet Dyer:

My mind to me a kingdom is;
Such present joys therein I find
As far exceeds all earthly bliss

* * *

Look, what I lack my mind supplies.
Lo, thus I triumph like a king,
Content with that my mind doth bring.

IN EDUCATION for privacy, however, more is involved than philosophical orientation to the cosmos. There is equally urgent need for education in the establishment and maintenance of moral harmony. From the days of primitive religion, through Greek tragedy, the Christian epic of sin and salvation, and modern psychology, Freudian and non-Freudian, to contemporary existentialism, there runs the theme of the uneasy conscience. The dramatic specter of moral guilt is the principal character in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of the greatest creations of literary genius. No matter what the learned explanation, the psychological state is one of inner moral disharmony. Though it may have outer causes, it is a private affliction and must be cured privately. In moments of despair or periods of cynicism we may doubt the existence or discernibility of moral meaning in the universe; but such a conclusion does not relieve the individual of the necessity for solving his personal moral problem. Even complete moral negativism, if not itself a moral philosophy, leaves the individual no recourse but to establish a private moral order in his life of action and reflection.

HERE AGAIN, the more sensitive the individual, the greater the potentiality for disorganization. It is the sensitive who are the most deeply wounded by moral indifference, disorder, and brutality. The predisposing causes of moral disorganization may be in the people and the things we love, in the institutions which demand that we conform to their customs and taboos, in the great world which so often mocks our need for moral significance and order. But a vision of the good life, the spirit must have; for devoid of it, the imagination is without moral perspective, conduct without guiding principles, and action without trustworthy habits.

For an individual so unprepared for life, confusion will efface meaning and create frustration, with the onset in the case of the unusually sensitive spirit of pathological disturbances which may for a period or for a lifetime destroy happiness. Education for privacy must therefore include the education of the moral personality, the gradual acquisition by the self of moral resources. Here, too, there are available to the student in generous measure the works of the great philosophical and religious thinkers; for probably no one of the persistent problems of life has had more of their systematic and concentrated attention. It is relevant here to note that the previously discussed philosophical orientation to the world is sometimes the foundation for moral orientation.

A THIRD REQUIREMENT in the education of the personality is the development of emotional stability. Of all the immediate causes of unhappiness, emotional disorder is unquestionably the most serious and the most common. Currently there is a feeling that under the pressures of modern life its incidence is steadily increasing. Unfortunately, emotions are the component of the personality about which we know the least, as modern sci-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence has come to realize. Our ignorance is largely a consequence of the fact that traditionally the emotions have been considered to be effects rather than causes.

Preoccupation with the flattering conviction that man is a rational animal has been attended with the assumption that therefore our emotions are under the domination of the reason. This assumption has been one of the basic tenets of formal education, though puzzled parents and self-conscious adults no doubt have all along had their suspicions. In our day, educators are being enlightened by psychology and the medical sciences on the subject of the devastating power of the emotions. Moreover, the modern conception of the integrated personality has redirected our approach to this subject, so that now we hypothesize and investigate in terms of interrelations and interactions. The simple classical vision of the reason enthroned in the psyche, making judgments, issuing commands, and directing the conscious life of the individual, is difficult to maintain in the face of the past record and the current spectacle of human behavior.

LET US GRANT that the contemporary individual lives in an age in which, as Goethe put it, "humanity twists and turns like a person on a sickbed trying to find a comfortable position." To offset this, however, he has the advantage of a better understanding of the compulsive and disruptive power of the emotions. He is aware of their insidious tendency to direct his thinking and affect his judgment. He knows that they feed on themselves and that, if they are of the destructive kind, they can bring him to the verge of despair. He knows that they can completely disorient him, isolating him from the friendship and sympathy of his fellow men, and estranging him from the beauty and utility of the world. He must learn that there is little he can do to remove the external causes, the irritants in his social and physical environment. In order to maintain or restore emotional stability *within* himself, he must learn to control the effects of these irritants *on* himself. Education of the emotions is education in self-control, in equanimity and serenity.

TO THESE three objectives of education for privacy — the attainment of a philosophical point of view, a steady vision of the good life, and serenity of spirit — I should like to add one more: The individual should be able to live entertainingly with himself. He should accumulate resources on which he can draw when he is at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leisure. The universal symptom of the absence of such resources is the homely but hapless state of boredom. It is an anomalous condition of the spirit, a state of indifference lying between pain and pleasure. Neither the mind nor the hands can find anything interesting to do. In contrast with the other troubles of the spirit which have been mentioned, there is little excuse for this great emptiness. For there is a marvelous cure for boredom, universally available, readily tapped, and virtually inexhaustible: the fine arts.

THIS CLAIM hardly needs defense. Nor is it necessary to enumerate the arts and to identify their respective potentialities for beguiling the mind and the heart. For illustrative purposes, however, let us consider one form of art enjoyment which is available to virtually every normal human being, young or old, learned or simple, saint or sinner — reading. Its great virtue for education for privacy is that it is a strictly private experience. No other human being is necessary to the reader at the moment of reading. He can take his book with him to the jungle or the desert, on the ocean, or the mountain top. He can select his company at will, and rid himself of it by a turn of the hand. It is potentially an inexhaustible resource: All ages of history; all countries; all varieties of human beings, and even of animals and plants and physical things; the entire range of human thoughts and feelings, hopes and fears, conquests and failures, victories and defeats; the real and the ideal — all are available at the turn of a page for the reader's contemplation and understanding.

WHEN WE MEASURE the impoverishment of him to whom this world is literally and figuratively a closed book, whose ear is deaf to music and whose eye blind to the glories of painting and sculpture, we come to realize the responsibility of liberal education for instruction in the arts. I say instruction purposely, because I believe that the presentation of opportunities for enjoyment and training in appreciation are not enough: There should also be instruction and encouragement in the production of art. As even the bungling amateur knows, there is no greater source of pleasure than creative activity.

The training of the most modest talent is an enrichment of a personality and develops another private resource for leisure hours. Even the unsuccessful attempt to create art, moreover, clarifies the understanding of art. To be sure, just as it is not necessary to trouble our friends with our thoughts,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so it is not necessary to bore our friends with our productions. It is, after all, not the improvement of the neighbor but the improvement of oneself that is the immediate object of education for privacy.

An understanding of the world, a vision of the good life, serenity of spirit, appreciation and practice of the fine arts — these, then, are the elements of the integrated personality, the development of which is the immediate object of liberal education. These are the resources which are accumulated in the course of education for privacy. Why, now, is it so important for every individual to possess these resources? In the first place, simply because he is going to need them. We never know when we are going to lose our external resources, our public possessions. Without private resources the individual has nothing to turn to when disappointment, frustration, or misfortune become his lot. In the great depression which is still vivid in our memories, there were many individuals who possessed only external resources. When they lost these, life was over for them. They could not go on living with themselves because of their intellectual, moral, emotional, and artistic poverty. He who possessed these resources, however, could exclaim with Thoreau: "Oh, how I laugh when I think of my vague, indefinite riches! No run on the bank can drain it, for my wealth is not possession but enjoyment."

Resources of the spirit are like savings: They must be accumulated before they are needed. When they are needed, there is no substitute for them. Sooner or later, the individual faces the world alone, and that moment may overwhelm him if he has no resources within himself.

Distraction helps but little and betrays us when we least expect it. We can escape our physical environment and our neighbors, but we cannot escape ourselves. Everyone with any maturity of experience and self-knowledge knows that the loneliest moments are sometimes experienced in the midst of the greatest crowds and the most elaborate entertainments. "... the man at war with himself is at war, though he sits in a garden surrounded by flowers and singing birds," says the novelist Cloete in *Congo Song*.

AND NOW, in conclusion, I wish again to pay my respects to the other half-truth, the improvement of others, which was so cavalierly dismissed in the beginning of this essay. That objective, together with the other objective, self-improvement, compose the whole truth, which is the grand objective of liberal education. Education for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

privacy and education for public service constitute education of the whole personality. He who is not educated for privacy is hardly fit to educate others. The blind cannot lead the blind. The man who is not at peace with himself cannot be trusted to lead his fellow men in the ways of peace.

The unbalanced leader is certain to unbalance the society in which he functions. Even the leader who is intent on the side of the good but who is a fanatic will stimulate fanaticism in his followers, arouse dogmatism and bigotry, and induce oppression and cruelty. When he is on the side of evil, he will lead his followers into such excesses and wickedness as will shame all humanity, and which even the innocent will wish to forget as soon as possible. Social pathology must in the last analysis be focused on the sickness of the individuals who compose the society. It is pure imagination, if not nonsense, to ascribe the ignorance, unbalance, and wickedness of a collection of human beings to a mysterious social entity such as the group mind or the social organism. We might as well divorce the concept of an epidemic from the notion of the individuals who are ill, or ascribe hunger to a societal stomach. People mislead one another exactly as they infect one another. The psychopathic leader is potentially as dangerous as the carrier of an infectious disease.

The safe leader, in terms of the elements of education for privacy, is one who understands his place in the world and can thus envisage the place of his fellow men; who can morally respect himself and can thus be respected by others; who has learned to control his emotions and can thus be trusted to exert control over others; who has learned to live in peace and contentment with himself and can thus with propriety urge others to do likewise.

We are living in a world and in a time when powerful leaders with millions of fanatical followers are committed to the forcible regimentation of their fellow men, according to formulas which have no initial authority but that of their own private dogmatism. They not only refuse to recognize the right of private thought and personal conscience to be considered in the management of public affairs, but they have abolished the concept of the individual as a private personality and have reduced him to the level of the bee in the hive. To restore the individual to his former dignity as a human being is the urgent need of the day. This, in my opinion, should be the special objective of contemporary education.

But liberal education must so educate the individual that he is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manifestly worthy of having his dignity recognized. If he wishes to lead his fellows, he must first learn to lead himself. Without education for privacy he will neither merit leadership nor learn to recognize it in others. He will strive in vain for happiness and success in private or public life until he has achieved understanding, goodness, serenity, and contentment within himself. That, according to my exegesis, is in this connection the meaning of the Biblical text: "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" It is surely what Thomas Hardy meant when he wrote:

He who is with himself dissatisfied,
Though all the world find satisfaction in him,
Is like a rainbow-coloured bird gone blind,
That gives delight it shares not.

Marten ten Hoor is dean of College of Arts and Sciences, and professor of philosophy at the University of Alabama.

Freedom of judgement can be attained only when we learn to estimate an individual according to his own ability and character. Then we shall find, if we were to select the best of mankind, that all races and all nationalities would be represented. Then we shall treasure and cultivate the variety of forms that human thought and activity has taken, and abhor, as leading to complete stagnation, all attempts to impress one pattern of thought upon whole nations or even upon the whole world. FRANZ BOAS

This country was not built by men who relied on somebody else to take care of them. It was built by men who relied on themselves, who dared to shape their own lives, who had enough courage to blaze new trails — enough confidence in themselves to take the necessary risks.

This self-reliance is our American legacy. It is the secret of "that something" which stamped Americans as Americans. Some call it individual initiative; others backbone. But whatever it is called, it is a precious ingredient in our national character — one which we must not lose.

The time has come for us to re-establish the rights for which we stand — to reassert our inalienable rights to human dignity, self-respect, self-reliance — to be again the kind of people who once made America great.

Such a crusade for renewed independence will require a succession of inspired leaders — leaders in spirit and in knowledge of the problem, not just men with political power who are opposed to communism, or to diluted communism, but men who are militantly for the distinctive way of life that was America. We are likely to find such leaders only among those persons who teach self-reliance and who practice it with the strict devotion of belief and understanding. J. OLLIE EDMUNDS, President, John B. Stetson University

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Revolution At Ramah

Frank Chodorov

This is the only recorded revolution
for *more* government instead of less

THE ISRAELITES had come on evil times. The Philistines not only had licked them roundly but had also made off with the sacred ark of the covenant. Among the tribesmen everything was at sixes and sevens. The camaraderie of wilderness days was giving way to social disintegration, now that they had settled down to village life in the hills around the Promised Land, in sight of the walled cities of the Amorites and within easy reach of the coastal towns inhabited by the Baal-worshippers. There was strife within the community, and it was along the bitter lines of class distinction. The master-and-slave relationship had sprung up out of nowhere; the commonality of clan-interest was somehow being dissolved by social stratification. The consequent demoralization made the erstwhile conquering herdsmen easy picking for the Philistines.

There was only one explanation for this reversal of form. They had perverted *Mishpat*. During their nomadic days this common-sense code of justice, this clan-ethic, had served them well. It gave them strength and prosperity. But new institutions had sprung up since they had become tillers of the soil, and these institutions not only violated their traditional code but were of the essence of Baalism, which Yahweh detested.

Yahweh had done well by the tribe of Joseph. He had led them safely out of the land of the Pharaohs, had favored them in the long years of battle with believers in strange gods, and had finally brought them to the outposts of the best piece of real estate then known. They prospered because they practiced *Mishpat*, the rules and rituals of social behavior, as prescribed by Yahweh. Deviation from this ethos was bound to bring his wrath upon them, and that meant hard times.

Mishpat was born of trial and error, bred by experience. It was the reduction to formulae of adjustments which had proved beneficial to the individual tribesmen and had prospered the tribe as a whole. It took care of everything.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There were conventions covering conjugal matters, and there were dietary safeguards of health; to prevent destructive feuds, principles of equity were worked out; slavery, as between themselves, would vitiate tribal strength and therefore was taboo; since they believed that access to land was the necessary condition of their lives, the soil was declared to be the common heritage, never to be commercialized. Though every man was enjoined to do that which was right in his own eyes, right was qualified by *Mishpat*, the rule of justice; and social pressure was enough to keep him in line. When a difference of interpretation occurred, the matter was referred to elders; and these Judges, because of their integrity and wisdom, spoke for and with the authority of Yahweh. They served without salary; their decisions carried weight.

The Israelites did nicely with this system when they were on the move. But now, at the time of Samuel, the last of the Judges, their economy had changed and the system went sour.

THINGS WERE going from bad to worse. Once a people leave the road of righteousness there is no telling where they will land. Even the judge system had broken down under the impact of the new economy; the anointed of Yahweh got to taking bribes. The story in the First Book of Samuel, chapter 8, tells how the old man had appointed a couple of his sons to help him out; he seems to have been in great demand among the clans, doing duty as a circuit judge. But these sons did not follow in his ways, for they "turned aside after lucre and perverted judgment." So the elders of Israel called upon Samuel at Ramah and lodged a protest.

It would be interesting to know something about the background of this protest committee; on the basis of the reform they suggested one is disinclined to rate them highly, and it could be suspected that they were of the newly arisen aristocracy with an axe of their own to grind. They advocated a political order which was foreign to Israelite thought and in direct imitation of Baalism. "Make us a king," they said, "to judge us like all nations." That is to say, instead of demanding social justice, as represented by *Mishpat,* they asked for a deliverer, a man of power, a policeman with a wand. That was Baalism at its worst.

Samuel was opposed to the proposed constitutional reform; he knew that it was unsound in principle and therefore Israel would not prosper by it. He took the matter under consideration, meaning

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he consulted Yahweh. He got an earful.

The fact is, said Yahweh, that these scalawags are not against you or the judge system. They are indeed plotting against me, the god who brought them safely out of Egypt. I have had trouble enough holding them in line; they have been flirting with other gods all along. And now they want a king. Well, let them have one and be done with it. But you might, as a parting shot, tell them what's in store for them. Not that it will do the least good, but get it off your chest anyway.

So Samuel said to the elders: This king you are asking for will have to have an army; and it will not be an army of volunteers, as in the old days, but he will conscript your sons. He will also set up a nobility over you, "captains over hundreds and captains over thousands," and this nobility will be loyal to their sovereign; for their interests will be tied up with his. Your daughters will be required to serve in the houses of the mighty. Your lands, the best of them, will be taken from you and vested in the nobility. Many of your goodliest young men, your maidservants and your manservants will become slaves. What's more, you can depend on your king to lay a load of taxes on you; yes, even a tenth part of your produce will go to keep up his establishment. When all this comes about and you realize the mistake you made in abandoning *Mishpat*, don't think that you can turn to Yahweh for relief; for he has washed his hands of you. He told me so.

"Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, nay; but we will have a king over us; that we may be like the other nations; and that our king may judge us, and fight our battles."

Samuel again reported the decision of the elders, and Yahweh threw up his hands. Thus came Saul and the Jewish State. And it is on record that from the time the Israelites substituted a king for *Mishpat* they were always in a peck of trouble.

IN ONE RESPECT this meeting held at Ramah was most unusual. It is the only revolutionary conclave on record at which the decision was made to abandon a regime of social power in favor of a regime of political power. Most revolutions have been instigated by resentment at the concentration of power and with the hope that the incumbent authority could be replaced by some restricted governing machinery. The ideal revolution is one that places government subservient under the popular will, making it a social instrument

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than a self-sufficient leader. But at Ramah we have a reversal of the formula; a people who had long enjoyed government by public opinion, circumscribed by custom and tradition, decided to try out the *Führer* principle. The trouble with that principle is that once it is put into practice it hardens into an immovable obstacle to freedom, and dislodgment of it becomes most difficult. That is what Samuel, who was something of a political scientist, meant when he said that the Jews could not expect Yahweh to lead them back to *Mishpat*, once they had abandoned it.

There is a close similarity between the revolution at Ramah and the drive of many Americans to institute a strong central government in place of the one envisioned by the Founding Fathers, a government of strictly delimited powers. These socialists — which is their proper name, whatever else they choose to call themselves — are likewise hellbent on giving up liberty and placing themselves under a kingship of some kind. If they succeed, will not the fate of ancient Israel befall America? Has any people who have sought surcease from the responsibilities of life in mortal authority and leadership come to a good end?

Frank Chodorov is editor of The Freeman.

AN AXIOM OF GOVERNMENT

THE GREATER THE NUMBER OF LAWS OR JUDICIAL DECISIONS, THE SMALLER THE NUMBER OF RIGHTS. The Ten Commandments and the Twelve Tables were known and understandable to everyone, but who could comprehend the enormous complications of modern legislation? Under such circumstances the requirement that every man know the laws is sheer mockery. The citizen of a civilized country, if he is without a legal adviser, is in increasing measure just as helpless as an African illiterate without a scribe; and in New York, the center of world economy, the businessman, once representative of freedom, cannot take a step except under mentorship of a legal specialist. In Russia there is no way of fathoming the meaning of justice. The demand for concise and clear legislation understandable to the people — a demand once expressed in such sharp opposition to the introduction of Roman law — is now manifested only in isolated instances; for example, in several results of plebiscites in Switzerland. Everywhere the Chinese puzzle of legalistics has practically wiped out the possibility of asserting one's rights — which is the strongest expression of individual freedom. FELIX SOMARY in "Democracy at Bay." New York: A. A. Knopf, 1952

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Equal Rights

Carl Schurz

German immigrant, Civil War general, senator, Interior Secretary, editor, author — Carl Schurz could understand the Declaration of Independence

THE PRINCIPLE of the Declaration of Independence — "all men are created free and equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable rights" — is the principle from which the Revolutionary Fathers derived their claim to independence. Upon this they founded the institutions of this country, and the whole structure was to be the living incarnation of this idea. This principle contains the programme of our political existence. It is the most progressive, and at the same time the most conservative one; the most progressive, for it takes even the lowliest members of the human family out of their degradation, and inspires them with the elevating consciousness of equal human dignity; the most conservative, for it makes a common cause of individual rights. From the equality of rights springs identity of our highest interests; you cannot subvert your neighbor's rights without striking a dangerous blow at your own. And when the rights of one cannot be infringed without finding a ready defence in all others who defend their own rights in defending his, then, and only then, are the rights of all safe against the usurpations of governmental authority.

This general identity of interests is the only thing that can guarantee the stability of democratic institutions. Equality of rights, embodied in general self-government, is the great moral element of true democracy; it is the only reliable safety valve in the machinery of modern society. There is the solid foundation of our system of government; there is our mission; there is our greatness; there is our safety; there, and nowhere else! This is true Americanism, and to this I pay the tribute of my devotion.

IT IS a matter of historical experience, that nothing that is wrong in principle can be right in practice. People are apt to delude themselves on that point; but the ultimate result will always prove the truth of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the maxim. Perhaps the most formidable danger for the safety of our institutions arises from the general propensity of political parties and public men to act on a policy of mere expediency, and to sacrifice principle to local and temporary success. And here, sir, let me address a solemn appeal to the consciences of those with whom I am proud to struggle side by side against human thraldom.

You hate kingcraft, and you would sacrifice your fortunes and your lives in order to prevent its establishment on the soil of this Republic. But let me tell you that the rule of political parties which sacrifice principle to expediency, is no less dangerous, no less disastrous, no less aggressive, of no less despotic a nature, than the rule of monarchs. Do not indulge in the delusion, that in order to make a government fair and liberal, the only thing necessary is to make it elective. When a political party in power, however liberal their principles may be, have once adopted the policy of knocking down their opponents instead of voting them down, there is an end of justice and equal rights. The history of the world shows no example of a more arbitrary despotism, than that exercised by the party which ruled the National Assembly of France in the bloodiest days of the great French Revolution. I will not discuss here what might have been done, and what not, in those times of a fearful crisis; but I will say that they tried to establish liberty by means of despotism, and that in her gigantic struggle against the united monarchs of Europe, revolutionary France won the victory, but lost her liberty.

THERE IS a thing which stands above the command of the most ingenious of politicians: *It is the logic of things and events.* It cannot be turned and twisted by artificial arrangements and delusive settlements; it will go its own way with the steady step of fate. It will force you, with uncompromising severity, to choose between two social organizations, one of which is founded upon privilege, and the other upon the doctrine of equal rights.

FORCE instead of right, privilege instead of equality, expediency instead of principle, being once the leading motives of your policy, you will have no power to stem the current. There will be new abuses to be corrected, new inconveniences to be remedied, new supposed dangers to be obviated, new equally exacting ends to be subserved, and your encroachments upon the natural rights of your opponents now, will be used as welcome precedents for the mutual oppression of parties

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then. Having once knowingly disregarded the doctrine of equal rights, the ruling parties will soon accustom themselves to consult only their interests where fundamental principles are at stake. Those who lead us into this channel will be like the sorcerer who knew the art of making a giant snake. And when he had made it, he forgot the charm-word that would destroy it again. And the giant snake threw its horrid coils around him, and the unforunate man was choked to death by the monster of his own creation.

This extract is from *Speeches of Carl Schurz*, 1865.

FRATERNITY OR EQUALITY

The fight is being waged on all fronts, and the most insidious idea employed to break down society is an undefined equalitarianism. . . . Such equalitarianism is harmful because it always presents itself as a redress of injustice, whereas in truth it is the very opposite. . . . The comity of peoples in groups large or small rests not on this chimerical notion of equality but upon fraternity, a concept which long antedates it in history because it goes immeasurably deeper in human sentiment. The ancient feeling of brotherhood carries obligations of which equality knows nothing. It calls for respect and protection, for brotherhood is status in family, and family is by nature hierarchical. . . .

Equality is a disorganizing concept in so far as human relationships mean order. It is order without a design; it attempts a meaningless and profitless regimentation of what has been ordered from time immemorial by the scheme of things. No society can rightly offer less than equality before the law; but there can be no equality of condition between youth and age or between the sexes; there cannot be equality even between friends. The rule is that each shall act where he is strong; the assignment of identical roles produces first confusion and then alienation, as we have increasing opportunity to observe. Not only is this disorganizing heresy busily confounding the most natural social groupings, it is also creating a reservoir of poisonous envy. How much of the frustration of the modern world proceeds from starting with the assumption that all are equal. . . . It is generally assumed that the erasing of all distinctions will usher in the reign of pure democracy. But the inability of pure democracy to stand for something intelligible leaves it merely a verbal deception. . . . If it promises equality of condition, it promises injustice, because one law for the ox and the lion is tyranny. RICHARD M. WEAVER. "Ideas Have Consequences." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Conscription Idea

Dean Russell

"THE PRINCIPLE of voluntarism should not be compromised." That policy on civilian manpower was recommended to the National Security Council in a May, 1954, report from the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The report suggests an extensive program of voluntary incentives as the best method to secure the most effective use of *civilian* manpower in time of war. Would not the principle of voluntarism work just as well for soldiers as for civilians? Would not present-day Americans volunteer to defend their country as our ancestors did in the earlier history of our nation? An increasing number of influential persons, including men who have devoted their lives to military affairs, are again beginning to think so.

AMONG THEM is Liddell Hart, the distinguished British military authority and military advisor to Encyclopaedia Britannica, who says: "Twenty-five years spent in the study of war . . . changed my earlier and conventional belief in the value of conscription. It brought me to see that the compulsory principle was fundamentally inefficient."

WHILE THE PRESENT Administration is now taking long-overdue steps to make military service more attractive to volunteers, it still depends on conscription to supply the bulk of its troops. In fact, the President has recommended to Congress a system of universal military training which is based squarely on the old German, Russian, and French tradition of compulsory military training for all young men as a matter of routine.

The principle of conscription is now fearfully close to becoming a permanent American institution. Before it becomes completely "accepted and non-debatable," let us briefly review the past performance of compulsory military service, consider its future possibilities, and examine some of the fundamental ideas behind it.

WHILE MANY sincere and patriotic Americans have been quick to advocate conscription in almost every real or imagined emergency, it was generally considered an un-American and undemocratic idea in the United States until 1917.

It is true that conscription was tried for a time in the Civil War,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but it seems to have done far more harm than good. The Draft Act became law in March of 1863 and the first call-up was made the following July. The resulting "draft riots" in New York, Boston, and other places necessitated the calling of regiments from the battlefields of Gettysburg to shoot American citizens who were rebelling against the then un-American idea of conscription.

Pitched battles raged in the streets of New York City for several days. Hundreds of people were hanged or shot, and property damage was enormous.

Some historians claim that one of the reasons General Meade didn't follow up his advantage over the retreating army of General Lee after Gettysburg was because so many of his soldiers were engaged in suppressing the "draft riots" behind his own lines. Still other regiments had to be held in readiness in case they were needed.*

The Draft Act was so unpopular that it garnered fewer than 50,000 soldiers, or less than three per cent of the total forces, in four draft calls! It hurt morale, encouraged favoritism and graft, and may well have actually lengthened the war.

THE CONFEDERACY also had a Draft Act — a year earlier and more extensive than that of the North. In fact, contrary to popular belief among us Southerners, the Confederacy had to draft most of its soldiers. This only multiplied the loss of life and the bitter consequences of a cause that became hopeless on the day it was subjected to the test of force. Our Southern leaders who showed such wisdom in most respects should have known that conscripts and slaves are not assets in building a sound civilization.

THE IDEA of conscription was discussed — and rejected by the central government — in both the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. After it was tried toward the end of the War Between the States — with such unfortunate consequences — it was rejected again. But with our entry into World War I, this form of involuntary servitude began to receive the popular support necessary to establish it as a permanent tradition in America.

Of all reasons, the idea of conscription was reactivated in 1917 in the name of freedom and as a means "to make the world safe for democracy"! Apparently our leaders believed that it was also the only way they could raise a large enough army to send abroad to fight in a war that didn't concern the territorial, trade, defense, or

*Richard B. Morris, *Encyclopedia of American History.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humanitarian interests of the United States.

SINCE THAT STATEMENT — as well as most of this entire article — runs contrary to many popularly accepted beliefs by the American people, on what facts and ideas does this writer base his conclusions? What are his qualifications to speak in these controversial areas?

Unquestionably, my qualifications as a military strategist are minor — so much so that I hesitate to discuss strategy at all. It is true that I am a strong advocate of an Air Force adequate for the defensive needs of our nation, including retaliation if our country is invaded or bombed. And I am also convinced that the Atomic Age has made obsolete any possible need or excuse for huge armies of foot soldiers *for defense*. But I may well be prejudiced in favor of air power because of my five years with the Air Force, at home and abroad, during World War II.

At any rate, there is no good reason why our duly qualified strategists can't practice their profession with volunteers as well as with conscripts! In fact, there are compelling reasons why they should prefer to do so.

FOR EXAMPLE, it seems to me axiomatic that a person who *wants* to do a thing has a far better chance of doing it more efficiently and more effectively than a person who is forced to do it against his will. One of my grandfathers honestly believed that slavery is cheaper than paying wages determined by a free market. But in spite of the seeming plausibility of his argument, he was wrong *economically* as well as morally. Actually, as any student of human actions and motivations in a free market can understand, the slave owners could have made more money by freeing their slaves and paying them wages.

For the same reason, conscripts and conscription are less effective and less efficient than volunteers and voluntary action. The Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, and the Seabees have always worked on the principle that volunteers are more effective than conscripts in war as well as in peace. I have no reason to suppose that the Army actually prefers conscripts to volunteers. The average conscript will always cost more and do less than the average volunteer. And when the war is over, he will also be first in line for benefits, preferences, and bonuses "for defending his country." This doesn't deny, of course, that many individual conscripts are hard workers and heroes, just as many individual slaves worked hard and even defended the system which held them in bondage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I HAVE every reason to believe that more than 90 per cent of all Americans will voluntarily defend their country when it is invaded or when *they* think that there is any danger of invasion by a foreign foe. For example, when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, what percentage of the American people do you believe stood ready to volunteer in some capacity to help repulse any further onslaught against peace-loving Americans and their legitimate territory? I say more than 90 per cent.

There may be a few thousand persons — or even a few hundred thousands — who wouldn't voluntarily defend themselves or their countrymen under any circumstances. If so, toleration of them is merely a part of the price we must pay to keep our own freedom; for when — even for a good cause — we force peaceful persons to do things contrary to their wishes and judgments, then upon what moral grounds could we ourselves object to being forced to commit acts which are against our consciences and better judgments? If we rely on mere numbers — the majority — to determine our actions, the ideas of conscience and personal responsibility have no meaning.

Anyway, while most draftees might actually *face* the enemy rather than be imprisoned or shot by their own countrymen, they could never be relied upon in any real defense emergency. In this connection, we might speculate a bit more deeply as to why so few — only one out of four — of our drafted soldiers used their weapons even when under actual enemy attack in Korea.*

While I am no more a psychologist than I am a military expert, I can still stand positively on the axiom that no person can be relied upon to do that which he is forced to do against his will. The alleged American attitudes sneeringly summarized in the phrase "ice cream and momism" are not the fundamental reasons a soldier doesn't measure up when he is drafted and sent thousands of miles from home to shoot other drafted soldiers in a war he doesn't understand or want to fight. The hundreds of thousands of mental cases and deserters among our drafted soldiers in World War II — plus the additional loss of the manpower required to attend or guard them — are strong proof of the idea that conscription is inefficient as well as immoral.

ACTUALLY, I can see no more logic in conscripting privates than in conscripting cadets for West Point. The reasons which would cause a

*Associated Press, May 16, 1951, reported in most daily newspapers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

person to reject the one are the same reasons which should cause him to reject the other. It is true that conscripted troops under voluntary commanders — like slaves under masters — may offer surface appearances of strength and efficiency. But since it is organized on a wrong principle, the inherent weakness in the system will eventually betray the people who are foolish enough to trust in it.

SOMEONE might say that only our best and most intelligent people would volunteer while the worst would stay home in safety — that all the casualties of war would be from the flower of our manhood.

I doubt that "worst" and "best" can be determined merely by the act of volunteering for military duty; many murderers and thieves in our prisons always request the privilege of fighting for their country — even if they must return after the war and complete their sentences.

Does anyone wish to claim that Quakers and other similar groups are our worst or least intelligent people?

THE ACT of volunteering in itself offers no conclusive proof of character one way or the other. The fact that I volunteered for World War II doesn't necessarily make me morally better or more intelligent than my college roommate who was sentenced to 15 years in a federal penitentiary because he chose to follow his belief that conscription is wrong. The person who can still hold to his principles when his friends and neighbors revile him and his family has a courage which is probably superior to that which most of us need when we face enemy fire.

ONE OF MY two Virginia grandfathers fought for the Confederacy. The other one chose to remain on his small farm in the Blue Ridge Mountains. Even when he was drafted, he still refused to fight in a war which he considered unnecessary. His countrymen who thought differently arrested and courtmartialed him, and sentenced him to be shot as a coward and a draft dodger.

I doubt that my grandfather was an undesirable or unintelligent person because of his belief that principles come from a source higher than the opinions of the majority of one's neighbors. Does anyone believe that such a man is a coward?

It seems to me that the arbitrary dividing of persons into categories such as this is evil in itself. I am not at all willing to concede that the persons who hold such an arrogant viewpoint are themselves any more intelligent or good than those they condemn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHILE MANY of the advocates of conscription tend to agree with me "in principle" that it is morally wrong to compel some persons to kill other persons, they always point out that we probably wouldn't have been able to raise a sufficiently large army to send to Europe in 1917 if we had relied on volunteers. Then they add: "And since we *had* to fight in World War I, we had no choice but to draft enough soldiers to do the job." This same general argument — that is, circumstances demanded and justified conscription — is advanced for World War II and Korea. This is merely another way of saying that the end justifies the means.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the means used to accomplish an objective are based on a wrong principle, the end cannot be good when all factors are considered. The exceedingly difficult and purely personal problem of distinguishing between right principles and wrong principles is task enough for anyone. Why make it more difficult by accepting the absurd proposition that good ends can result from evil means? Such a concept is the equivalent of attempting to save immortal souls by means of a state church with compulsory attendance and support.

IN THE SENSE that anything is the sum of its parts, it is a truism to state that the means *are* the end. It cannot be otherwise because the end is merely the summation and resultant of all the means used to achieve it. As Emerson phrased it: "Cause and effect, means and ends, seed and fruit, cannot be severed; for the effect already blooms in the cause, the end pre-exists in the means, the fruit in the seed."

In the continuing sequence of cause and consequence — means and ends — any consequence immediately becomes the "cause" of another consequence; for example, the announced goal of our entry into World War I was "to end all wars"! But no one can control the consequences of his decisions; he can control only the means he uses. The goal of abolishing war couldn't possibly succeed when the method selected to achieve the goal was war itself.

THIS IDEA that war can be used as a weapon to end war — "We'll have peace even if we have to fight for it!" — is a fallacy that has led millions of sincere persons to the slaughter fields. Victory or defeat in war is never a complete end; it is only an arbitrarily selected point in a series of continuing actions and reactions. The only certainty is this: The use of force in the present against *any* peaceful person will cause increased hatred and opposition and conflict in some degree

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or form in the future. In human relationships, the result of the use of violence against peaceful persons may be delayed or obscured, but the law of action and reaction works in human relationships as well as in the physical sciences.

The fact that an announced goal may be reached by a mixture of good and bad means (as is so often the case) doesn't deny this principle; it merely misleads the person who fails to see that the goal was attained in spite of — not because of — the evil means employed. If a thief contributes some of his loot to the fund for building a hospital, does that good end either depend on or justify his evil means?

But since the advocates of compulsory military service contend that moral arguments against conscription "aren't practical" — and since they offer as proof our military victories abroad since 1917 — it seems necessary to explore briefly the results of our entry into those conscript wars.*

I AM WELL AWARE that many persons still believe that the Kaiser and Hitler both planned all along to invade the United States and enslave its people. And I readily admit that *if* we had to choose between fighting in Europe and fighting at home, military strategy should have determined the best time and location for our defense. But that big *if* must first be considered.

As nearly as I can judge, Germany and England and their allies were faced with the military necessity for a truce with no victor in the fall of 1916, or even before. Without outside help, neither appeared capable of defeating the other. If the United States couldn't wait for them to work out their own truce, then, as a peace-loving nation, we could at least have offered our "good offices" — not just a conventional gesture but an impartial and sincere offer to arbitrate without prejudice or favor.

For those who claim we couldn't have succeeded, or that we tried and failed, I suggest a study of our procedure in 1905 in mediating the cessation of hostilities between the stalemated Russians and Japanese. In that case, we actually wanted a truce. Did we in World War I?

Does anyone really believe that a nation with sufficient manpower and materiel to determine the victor in World War I couldn't have used its moral and strategic positions to end the bloodshed by nego-

*The background for many of my admittedly brief statements on World Wars I and II come from reading the works of Charles A. Beard, Charles C. Tansill, Frederic R. Sanborn, and others among the so-called "revisionist" historians. Their facts and ideas generally strike me as more logical and complete than those advanced by the so-called "court historians." Both groups or "schools of thought" are represented in any adequate library.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tiating a truce with no victor? In my opinion, the United States didn't do it because its leaders didn't want to do it.

INSTEAD, our leaders chose sides and decided to use violence "to make the world safe for democracy" by conscripting our young men at home and forcing them to fight in Europe. That decision probably added two years to the conflict. The continuation of the war caused a reluctant but desperate Germany to send Lenin into Russia to start a revolution and to establish communism. Our entry into the war led directly to Versailles and a vindictive "peace" which set the stage for Hitler. The United States itself was the advocate of the plan to fragment Europe into small nations whose intense nationalism — expressed in the form of tariffs, passports, quotas, and other such personal and economic restrictions — could only be steps toward more bloody conflict.

Our armed intervention added additional millions to the casualty lists, established the reactionary Old World idea of compulsory military service as a permanent tradition in America, saddled our own country with a centralized bureaucracy, and paved the way for permanent conflict as a way of life.

When the consequences of World War I finally arrived in the form of World War II, a few persons in positions of power had already committed the United States to one side well before Pearl Harbor.* There are those who say we *had* to choose. Actually, did we have to choose between Hitler and Stalin? If so, do many persons believe that a triumphant Germany without any aid from us would have posed as serious a problem as has our "firm friend and ally" Russia, whom we possibly saved from utter defeat? And for those who may claim that this is hindsight, I recommend a rereading of the prewar warnings of Robert Taft, Herbert Hoover, Charles Lindbergh, and other persons of high standing.

At the same time that we were choosing Stalin over Hitler, we

*There are several history books which offer documentary evidence that the United States was irrevocably committed to war against Germany and Japan long before December 7, 1941, and that the "surprise attack" was not unduly surprising or displeasing to some of our top leaders. There are also many other history books which offer proof that we were attacked because the Japanese and German people are innately evil and wanted to destroy the good people of Russia and the United States. Take your pick, but keep this unquestionable fact well in mind: When two enemy armies clash for any reason, it is only human that each will claim to be defending itself against the other and to be marching under the banner of God, of justice, of peace, of freedom. The only thing surprising about this fact is that it should surprise anyone. History is an *interpretation*, not a mere chronology, of events. It is composed of what people believe and feel, as well as what actually happened. Who expects the partisan survivors of any war to say, or even to believe, that they and their dead comrades fought and died for nothing or an evil cause?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were also choosing China over Japan — long before Pearl Harbor. When Japan was defeated, we then somehow managed to undermine our ally in China, Chiang Kai-shek, and to set the stage for Mao Tse-tung and more communism. I doubt that we have any reason for pride in the results of our unnecessary interference. And the fact remains that *the decisions which were made by our leaders before and during World War II were based squarely on the idea of conscripting unwilling persons to enforce those decisions.*

That strikes me as unquestionable evidence that the American people in general wanted no part of it. When the people instinctively reject a proposition — when they will not voluntarily participate with their lives and their property and their sacred honor — who among us has any mandate from God to say that they are wrong and must be coerced against their wills? That is the heady stuff from which dictators are spawned.

THERE HAVE BEEN some especially bitter arguments about Korea — one of the several probable wars to which we seem to have committed ourselves by our intervention in World War II and by our continuation of conscription and compulsory military training. Usually the advocates of compulsory military service claim that if we hadn't fought in Korea, we would have to fight in San Francisco. Apparently, they have given no consideration at all to the problem of logistics and the difficulty faced by the enemy who would have to transport ten million or so men with full equipment for a distance of from 3,000 to 5,000 miles through hostile seas and air.

SOMETIMES these sincere but emotional advocates of conscription and foreign wars leave me with the distinct impression that what they mostly have in mind is to fight to the last drop of Russell's conscripted blood and confiscated property.* Of course, the supporters of compulsory service usually add: "I'm willing to take my chances if called" or "I did my part in the last war" or "I pay my taxes" or "I have a family to support" or "I'm willing to work in a defense plant" or offer some other reason why they shouldn't volunteer for duty in a war they allegedly approve and consider necessary to their safety.

*While this article is confined mostly to the military phase of conscripting persons to fight, the same basic ideas also apply to the conscripting of property and labor. When the dictator of communist Russia, Joseph Stalin, was once challenged on his idea of conscripting all the property of all the people for state use, he is alleged to have asked his questioners why they considered it more immoral and illogical to conscript lifeless property than to conscript life itself, as all the capitalist countries were doing. His challengers were unable to give him a convincing answer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To ME, the question is both harsh and simple: What will *I* do? It may be great sport to indulge in speculating about what other people should be forced to do, but it is quite another question when a person sits down to decide what he himself will do. As we used to say in our poker games overseas when a fairly large bet was made: "This will separate the men from the ribbon clerks."

Would I voluntarily sacrifice *my own life* — or, for that matter, even two or three years of it — in Korea in an attempt to prevent the North Koreans and the Chinese from conquering South Korea? After listening to all the experts and thinking about all the reasons, my answer is a point-blank "No." If my answer had been "Yes," you may rest assured that I would have volunteered for duty in Korea. If necessary, I would have arranged for my own passage at my own risk — just as many Americans voluntarily and individually fought in the Spanish Civil War and the Arab-Israeli War, just as thousands of our forefathers fought the Indians, French, Spanish, Dutch, English, and other Americans who they thought were infringing on their rights.

From the vantage point of some Korean battlefield, I may have felt that I was entitled to write to my countrymen and try to explain why I thought it might be to their advantage to join me or, at least, voluntarily to support me with their own honestly acquired property. I didn't volunteer because I can see no point at all in traveling several thousands of miles from home to fight the victims of the conscriptive programs of foreign governments. I doubt seriously that many, if any, of my fellow countrymen would have gone to Korea voluntarily, or even have voluntarily supported that war with their own resources. And I have no reason at all to assume it would be different with Formosa or Indo-China.

SUPPOSE A FOREIGN ENEMY were actually attacking a peaceful United States which had withdrawn its military forces from the various foreign nations all over the world. Suppose we had thus left no opening at all for charges of militarism, imperialism, and colonialism. I am confident that we would not be attacked under those circumstances, but let us suppose we were attacked or directly threatened with attack. Again, what would *I* do? I would (in fact, will) volunteer for the duration and for any assigned duty, and I would willingly subject myself to the leadership of the duly appointed or selected experts. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that almost all other Americans would be hastening to join me

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in whatever capacities they were assigned.

The advocates of conscription seem necessarily to be taking the position that I and most other Americans are too stupid to recognize a danger and to act in behalf of our own welfare. Either that, or they look upon us as unpatriotic cowards. Whatever the reason, they show no hesitation in advocating the use of compulsion upon us "for our own good."

"BUT THIS TIME it's different," I'm often told. "You may possibly be right about World Wars I and II, but this time we truly have no choice but to fight the communists in Europe and Asia or to surrender to them at home. And we would far rather have our freedom conscripted from us temporarily by our own governmental and military authorities than to lose it permanently to the Russians."

This argument is, of course, the old "either-or" proposition which can be true or merely a gimmick to mislead foolish or unwary persons. In this instance, the "either-or" approach is completely spurious.

If I had to choose, I too would prefer a democratically elected or appointed American master rather than a conquering Russian master or, for that matter, any other foreign master. But no such choice is necessary. Those who advocate the "temporary loss" of our freedom in order to preserve it permanently are advocating only one thing: the abolition of liberty. In order to fight a form of slavery abroad, they advocate a form of bondage at home! However good their intentions may be, those people are enemies of your freedom and my freedom; and I fear them far more than I fear any potential Russian threat to my liberty. These sincere but highly emotional patriots are clear and present threats to freedom; the Russians are still thousands of miles away.

"BUT YOU DON'T understand," the advocates of compulsory military service continue to argue. "Unless we have conscription, and unless we station our troops all around the communist borders to contain communism, the communists will surely conquer the United States and enslave us all with their evil philosophy."

Actually, those sincere people aren't talking about the dangers of communism itself, which is "any system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production, and some approach to equal distribution of the products of industry." Over the past fifty years, that philosophy of government ownership and government controls has steadily gained favor in the United States

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by vote of the majority who claim to be against communism. What my opponents really fear is the Russian army and the plans of the Russian leaders "to conquer the world by revolution and armed intervention."

Let us concede that the Russians are even more determined that the world shall follow their way of life than we Americans are determined that our way of life is best for the world. Our history of armed intervention all over the globe—beginning with our occupation of the Philippines and lasting through both World Wars and continuing with our vast global commitments into the future—won't prove this, but let us concede it anyway.

CAN THE RUSSIANS start a revolution in the United States? Categorically, they can't. And every American citizen, including the few who have pledged their allegiance to Russia, probably knows this. There will never be a successful revolution in America unless the majority of the people want it or refuse to oppose it. In either instance, it will be an American decision, not Russian. If the United States finally adopts the economic policies of communism, it will be because the people want communism or don't care one way or the other. If we finally go completely totalitarian at home in order to fight totalitarianism abroad, we will have done it to ourselves.

Can the Russians and their conquered "allies" invade and successfully occupy the United States? Again categorically, they can't, now or at any conceivable time in the future. I have yet to hear a responsible person offer any evidence that they could.

Even if the Russians can't successfully invade us or start a revolution, this question still remains: Will they drop hydrogen bombs on our cities?

They might try it for either of two reasons: fear of our intentions or retaliation to our acts. If those two possibilities are ruled out, I can think of no reason at all why the Russians would attempt to bomb New York and other cities and slaughter millions of Americans merely for the fun of killing them.

It is true that the Russians' fear of our intentions—like our fear of their intentions—could be responsible for almost anything, including a surprise bombing raid. Fear is such a powerful and unreasoning emotion that it even causes many Americans to advocate a "preventive war" against Russia! It would hardly be surprising to discover that their opposite numbers in Russia are advocating a "preventive war" against the United States—and for exactly the same reasons.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SINCE THE RUSSIANS can't occupy America any more than we Americans can occupy Russia, can you think of one reason why the Russians would drop bombs on American cities — or why we Americans would drop bombs on Russian cities — except hideous fear of the intentions of each toward the other? This fear could be eliminated by either side. For example, our fear of the Russians would largely disappear if they pulled all their troops back into Russia proper and kept them there. Likewise, would not the Russians' fear of our intentions toward them evaporate if we pulled our troops and military commitments back into the Western Hemisphere and kept them here? If either were done, need there any longer be this horrible fear of hydrogen bombs wiping out millions of people in New York and Moscow? At any rate, this much seems certain: As long as we keep troops in countries on Russia's borders, the Russians can be expected to act somewhat as we would act if Russia were to station troops in Guatemala or Mexico — even if those countries wanted the Russians to come in!

True, if we pulled our troops and military commitments back into the Western Hemisphere, the Russians might attempt to occupy all of Germany or, more probably, to establish a German government of their own choice. Could anyone blame them for that any more than they could blame us for establishing in Japan a "friendly" government under a constitution of our own design?

The Russians might also desire to extend their sphere of influence over various other countries — just as the imperial predecessors of the present Russian leaders did, and just as their successors under any political arrangement will probably continue to do. Every powerful nation in history — including the United States — has attempted the same thing in one way or another. I can see no more logic in fighting Russia over Korea or Outer Mongolia, than in fighting England over Cyprus, or France over Morocco, or — well, take your pick of any one of hundreds of similar cases. The historical facts of imperialism and spheres of influence are not sufficient reasons to justify the destruction of freedom within the United States by turning ourselves into a permanent garrison state and stationing conscripts all over the world. We are rapidly becoming a caricature of the thing we profess to hate.

I have more faith in myself and in my fellow Americans than do these politicians and humanitarians who desire to defend my freedom by depriving me of it. Obviously, it would be easy enough to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hire good and patriotic men to devote their lives to the task of planning and maintaining defenses against any possibility of invasion from abroad. And I am convinced that the rest of us would be available for voluntary duty whenever an invasion occurred or seemed imminent.

A MANIA for compulsory equality has swept this nation. It now applies to how we shall die or face death, as well as to how we shall live, work, and be educated. It is as illogical in the one instance as in the other. This compulsory equality disease is undermining our heritage of freedom. The overwhelming majority of our founders and early patriots were opposed to compulsory military service, even under such desperate circumstances as Valley Forge; most of them rejected the conscription idea as a direct violation of the freedom for which they were fighting and which they wanted to pass on to their posterity. They also warned us to stay out of foreign squabbles and to fear the persons who desire authority over other persons.

"Times have changed," of course. But the principles haven't. They never do. If we continue to ignore them, it is at our peril.

Dean Russell is a member of the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education.

At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, If it ever reach us it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time, or die by suicide. ABRAHAM LINCOLN, Lyceum Address, January 27, 1837.

In Virginia a draft was ever the most unpopular and impracticable thing that could ever be attempted. Our people . . . had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions. THOMAS JEFFERSON, Letter to John Adams, 1777.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In An Ideal America

EVERY PERSON SHOULD BE FREE

. . . to pursue his ambition to the full extent of his abilities, regardless of race or creed or family background.

. . . to associate with whom he pleases for any reason he pleases, even if someone else thinks it's a stupid reason.

. . . to worship God in his own way, even if it isn't "orthodox."

. . . to choose his own trade and to apply for any job he wants — and to quit his job if he doesn't like it or if he gets a better offer.

. . . to go into business for himself, be his own boss, and set his own hours of work — even if it's only three hours a week.

. . . to use his honestly acquired property or savings in his own way — spend it foolishly, invest it wisely, or even give it away.

. . . to offer his services or products for sale on his own terms, even if he loses money on the deal.

. . . to buy or not to buy any service or product offered for sale, even if the refusal displeases the seller.

. . . to disagree with any other person, even when the majority is on the side of the other person.

. . . to study and learn whatever strikes his fancy, as long as it seems to him worth the cost and effort of studying and learning it.

. . . to do as he pleases in general, as long as he doesn't infringe the equal right and opportunity of every other person to do as he pleases.

The above, in a nutshell, is the way of life which the libertarian philosophy commends. It means no special privilege from government for anyone. It is the way of individual liberty, of the free market, of private property, of government limited to securing these rights equally for all.

LEONARD E. READ

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperial Chinese Welfare State

M. Huc

It is a curious fact that the greater part of those social theories which have lately thrown the public mind of France into a ferment, and which are represented as the sublime results of the progress of human reason, are but exploded Chinese Utopias which agitated the Celestial Empire centuries ago.

In the 11th century of our era, the Chinese nation, under the dynasty of Song, presented a spectacle nearly analogous to that seen in Europe, and France especially, of late years. The great and knotty questions of social and political economy filled all minds and split into parties every class of society. The nation was divided into two furious parties; pamphlets, libels, inflammatory writings of all kinds were daily flung profusely to the multitude, who devoured them with avidity.

The reformer, or chief of the Socialist party, was the famous Wang-ngan-ché, a man of remarkable talent, who kept all classes of the empire in excitement during the reign of several emperors. Chinese historians say that he had received from nature a mind far above mediocrity, which was brought to perfection by careful culture. In youth he studied with ardour and application, and his efforts were crowned with success; he was distinguished by honourable mention among those who received the rank of doctor at the same time.

The popularity of Wang-ngan-ché fluctuated greatly at various periods during the time that he bent all his efforts to reorganize, or rather to revolutionize the empire. His power was almost unlimited beneath the emperor Chen-tsoung, who, charmed with the brilliant qualities of the reformer, gave him his entire confidence.

The executive and the tribunals were soon filled with his creatures, and, seizing the favourable moment to realize his schemes, the ancient order of things was soon overthrown. His innovations and reforms were greeted enthusiastically by his partisans, and attacked with envenomed eagerness by his enemies.

According to Wang-ngan-ché, the carrying out of his scheme was to procure infallible happiness to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people in the development of the greatest possible material enjoyments for everyone. Whilst reading the history of this famous epoch in the dynasty of Song, one is forcibly struck with the resemblance of the writings and harangues of Wang-ngan-ché to those which, in our own time, we have seen propounded in the newspapers and the senate.

"The first and most essential duty of a government," said the Chinese socialist, "is to love the people and to procure them the real advantages of life, which are plenty and pleasure. To accomplish this object it would suffice to inspire everyone with the unvarying principles of rectitude, but as all might not observe them the state should explain the manner of following these precepts and enforce obedience by wise and inflexible laws. In order to prevent the oppression of man by man the State should take possession of all the resources of the Empire and become the sole master and employer. The State should take the entire management of commerce, industry, and agriculture into its own hands, with the view of succouring the working classes and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich." According to these new regulations, tribunals were to be established throughout the Empire, which were to fix the price of provisions and merchandise. For a certain number of years taxes were to be imposed — to be paid by the rich — from which the poor should be exempt. The tribunals were to decide who was rich and who poor. The sum thus collected was to be reserved in the coffers of the State, to be distributed to aged paupers, to workmen out of employ, and to whoever should be judged to stand most in need of it.

According to Wang-ngan-ché the State was to become the only proprietor of the soil; in each district the tribunals were to assign the land annually to the farmers, and distribute amongst them the seed necessary to sow it, on condition that the loan was repaid either in grain or other provisions after the harvest was gathered, and in order that all the land should be profitably cultivated, the officers of the tribunals should fix what kind of crop was to be grown, and supply the seed for it.

"It is evident," said the partisans of the new scheme, "that by these means abundance and happiness will reign throughout the land. The only people who can suffer by this state of things are the usurers and monopolists, who never fail to profit by famine and all public calamities, to enrich themselves and ruin the working classes. But what great harm will it be to put an end at last to the exactions of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these enemies of the people? Does not justice require that they should be forced to restitute their ill-gotten gains? The State will be the only creditor, and will never take interest. As she will watch over agriculture and fix the current price of provisions, there will always be a supply proportionate to the harvest. In case of famine in any one spot, the great agricultural tribunal of Pekin, informed by the provincial tribunals of the various harvests of the Empire, will easily restore the equilibrium by causing the superfluity of the fertile provinces to be transported into those which are a prey to want. Thus the necessaries of life will always be sold at a moderate price, there will no longer be any classes in want, and the State, being the only speculator, will realize enormous profits annually, to be applied to works of public utility."

THIS RADICAL REFORM entailed of course the destruction of large fortunes and the reduction of all classes to a more uniform condition, and this was precisely the aim of Wang-ngan-ché and his followers. This bold scheme did not, as with us, stop short at theory, for the Chinese are much more daring than they are reputed to be. The Emperor Chen-tsoung, persuaded by the arguments of Wang-ngan-ché, placed entire authority in his hands, and the social revolution began. Sse-ma-kouang, who had struggled long and fruitlessly against the reformer, determined to make a last effort, and addressed to the Emperor a remarkable petition, from which we shall quote the passage relative to the advancing of seed-corn to the tiller of the land.

"It is proposed to advance to the people the seed with which they are to sow the ground. At the end of winter, or in the beginning of spring, the officers will supply each man with the quantity they judge necessary, gratuitously. Immediately after the gathering of harvest, the same quantity and no more will be demanded back. What can be more advantageous to the people? By this means all lands will be cultivated, and abundance will reign throughout the provinces of the Empire.

"In theory nothing can be more attractive and beneficial, in practice nothing more injurious to the country. We will suppose the grain distributed, and eagerly received by the people (though on this point I have much doubt); do they really make the use of it for which it is destined? Whoever believes this must have very little experience, and judges far too favourably of the common order of men. The interest of the moment is what concerns them most; the greater part never look beyond the day, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very few indeed trouble their heads about the future.

"The seed, then, is entrusted to them, and they begin by consuming part; they sell or exchange it for something which they imagine they need more than anything else. Corn has been given them; they leave off working, and become idle. But supposing all this does not happen: the grain is sown, all the necessary labours of cultivation are properly performed, the time of gathering the crop arrives, and they are called upon to repay what was lent them. The harvest which they have watched as it grew and ripened, and regarded as their own property, the well-earned fruit of their labours, must now be divided. Part must be yielded up, or sometimes, in bad seasons, the whole crop. How many reasons will be alleged for refusing to do so! How many real and imaginary necessities will stand in the way of the restitution!

"The tribunals, we shall be answered, which are established expressly for this department, will despatch their satellites to enforce the payment of what is due. Doubtless; and beneath the pretext of demanding what is due, what extortion, what robbery and violence will be committed! I do not mention the enormous cost which such establishments would entail; but, after all, at whose expense would they be maintained? At the expense of the Government, the nation, or the farmers? Whichever it may be, who will derive advantage from it? It may be alleged that this practice of advancing the seed has long been in use in the province of Chen-si, and that none of these evil results have taken place; it appears, on the contrary, that the people find it desirable, since they have made no request for its repeal. I have but one reply to make to this. I am a native of Chen-si; I passed the first part of my life there; I have been an eye-witness to the miseries of the people; and I can affirm that, of the evils under which they suffer, they attribute two-thirds to this practice, against which they murmur unceasingly. Let candid inquiry be entered into, and the true state of things will be made manifest."*

THE CHRONICLES of the time add that on the side of Sse-ma-kouang were seen all the most distinguished men of the Empire, whether renowned for wit, experience, talents, judgment, or rank, and who all added their prayers and entreaties to his; then, changing their tone, they accused Wang-ngan-ché of disturbing the public tranquillity.

But amid the violent attacks and clamour that rose against him on

*Memories sur la Chine, Vol. X. p. 48.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all sides, the reformer remained ever calm and imperturbable. Possessed of the confidence of the sovereign, he smiled at the vain efforts of his enemies to ruin him. He read the declamations and satires which they presented to the Emperor under the name of respectful representations, humble supplications, and so forth, and appeared not to be moved by them in the slightest.

When the Emperor, persuaded by the arguments of his adversaries, was on the point of yielding and restoring the form of government to the old footing, Wang-ngan-ché would calmly say to him, "Why should you be hasty in this matter? Wait till experience has shown you the result of the measures which we have adopted for the benefit of your realm and the happiness of your subjects. Beginnings are always difficult, and it is only after overcoming many obstacles that a man can hope to reap the fruit of his labour. Be firm, and all will go well. Ministers, nobles, and Mandarins have all risen against me. I am not surprised at it; they cannot quit the common routine, and adopt new customs. Little by little they will grow used to these innovations, their natural aversion will die away of its own accord, and they will end by applauding what they are now so eager to decry."

Wang-ngan-ché maintained his ascendancy throughout the reign of Chen-tsoung; he put all his plans in execution, and overturned the country at his ease. According to Chinese historians, his social revolution was not successful; the nation became more deeply plunged in misery than ever. But that which excited the public opinion most deeply against this bold reformer was his attempt to remodel literature, and subject it to his despotic system. Not only did he change the form of examination for the grades of literary rank, but he caused his own commentaries on the sacred books to be adopted as the correct explanation.

On the death of the Emperor, Wang-ngan-ché was immediately deposed; the reigning Empress sent for Sse-ma-kouang, who had been living in retirement. She named him governor of the young Emperor, and Prime Minister. His first step in this important post was to efface every trace of the government of Wang-ngan-ché, who died not long after; nor did Sse-ma-kouang long survive him. The memory of these two men has been by turns execrated with all the virulence of political passion; and in this, again, the Chinese have shown a strong resemblance to the Europeans.

Abbe Huc was Missionary Apostolic in China. He traveled throughout the Far East from 1838 to 1852. This extract is from his *The Chinese Empire*, 1855.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Religion In American Life

Ben Moreell

A layman re-examines and appraises the meaning of two vital facets of the traditional American way of life

SINCE OUR SUBJECT is religion and its place in American life, we must start with these questions: What is *religion?* What is *American life?* There are many concepts of each, with wide divergences of meaning and emphasis.

"Religion," Webster says, "is the service and adoration of God . . . in pursuit of a way of life regarded as incumbent on true believers."

St. James said, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

And Karl Marx said, "Religion is the opium of the people."

These and other definitions have failed to satisfy my desire for a guide for my personal conduct. So I have prepared this one for my own use: *Religion is the search for a satisfying way of life so conducted that, with faith and by His grace, I can approach closer to God and learn what He wants me to do.*

This concept is based on my belief that man yearns for truth, goodness, and beauty. He wants to see them expressed in the specific issues of his daily living. He has learned, by trial and error, that this can be achieved only by moving toward God. Thus, he can obtain better understanding of the laws which govern a good life.

WHAT IS "American life"? Or better — What is "American life" as it was intended by those who established our Republic?

I believe that this kind of "life" began long before the American Revolution of 1776. However, it was defined in certain statements of fundamental principles which were set forth at that time.

The American Revolutionary idea was founded on a new application of certain concepts which were part of the religion of Christendom.

Basic to all others was the concept that God rules the universe, with its corollary, that all men are creatures of God. It follows that if men are creatures of God, each man

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is sovereign in his relations with his fellow men, and, therefore, has worth and dignity. The concept of individual sovereignty gave birth to the idea of limited government. That is, the concept of limited government may be likened to the bottom rung of a ladder, the rung above is the concept of individual sovereignty and above all is the God concept.

Those who launched this American experiment believed that each of us has an inalienable right to life, which includes the right to protect and sustain that life. The sustenance of life requires the right to control the fruits of one's labor, that is, one's honestly acquired property. Without these corollary rights, the right to life has no meaning. To make those rights secure, an agent was to be established whose function would be to do for all of them, collectively but equally, that, and only that, which each one had a right to do for himself individually.

This agent, which they called "government," was to defend the lives, the liberties, and the livelihoods of the nation's citizens; to invoke a common justice; and to keep the records incidental thereto. Other than this, the people would be free to pursue their own interests; provided such pursuit would not lead them to trespass upon the rights of others.

WHAT WAS so revolutionary about those ideas? It was this: Never before in history had any people succeeded in establishing themselves as completely sovereign. Never before had any people succeeded in relegating the political agency of force to the position of a servant. Never before had the idea been put into practice that the fruits of one's labor are one's own to keep, to trade, or even to give away, as he chooses. Always before it was the agency of force — government — that was sovereign; and any right to one's product, even to one's life, was a right granted *to* the people *by* the government.

As an example, I cite the Magna Carta, wherein King John stated: "Wherefore our will is, and we firmly command . . . that the men in our kingdom have and hold the aforesaid liberties, rights and concessions . . . to them and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and places forever . . ."

It appears that even the barons thought of "rights" not as something which comes from God, but as something to be taken from the King when they had enough power to do so.

But in the original American vision the powers of government were to be confined within narrow limits. This vision was derived from the concepts that the rights of man come from God; that they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are inalienable; that it is the function of government to make them secure; and that when any form of government fails to serve this end, it is the right and duty of the people to alter or abolish it.

In effect, the Founding Fathers were trying to set up a secular order based on their idea of the pattern laid down by God for man's conduct in society. This was in strict conformity with the basic truth that *every social order derives its sanctions from the prevailing conception of the cosmic order.* As evidence of faith in the sanction of "Divine Providence" for their actions, they pledged to each other "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor."

They believed there could be no divorcement of religious principle from government. They held that individual liberty must be subjected to the restraints of God's laws; that liberty without a religious foundation quickly becomes license; that license breeds immorality, which calls forth the police power of government to restrain it. Power is insatiable; it feeds upon itself and soon becomes corrupt. The further loosening of moral law calls for more power in government. Then liberty is in mortal danger!

WE HAVE ample evidence of the unity of religion and government which guided the actions of our political forebears. There is the statement, attributed to William Penn: "If you are not governed by God, you will be ruled by tyrants."

George Washington in his farewell address said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

And further evidence is found in the statements of a neutral observer — Alexis de Tocqueville — the gifted French scholar, who, after an extended visit to America in 1831, wrote: ". . . whilst the law permits the Americans to do what they please, religion prevents them from conceiving, and forbids them to commit, what is rash or unjust . . .

"Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must be regarded as the first of their political institutions . . ."

Thus, we see that religion is the cornerstone of our heritage. This is attested by the Constitutions of 47 of our 48 States, in which it is recognized that religious principle forms the base of political and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social doctrine. It is confirmed, also, by an historic decision of our Supreme Court in 1892, in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity against the United States, in which the Court stated: "This [the United States] is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of America to this hour there is a single voice making this affirmation."

Upon this rock, the conviction that God must be in all things, our people built a great and free nation. This was the ideal of "American life" as it was conceived by those who established this Republic.

What is our current situation? I believe there are many thoughtful persons, devoted to the traditions of our country and our spiritual heritage, who are profoundly disturbed by what appears to be a growing secularism throughout our body politic, including our churches. They are disturbed by what appears to be a disposition on the part of official church bodies to add the weight of the churches to the efforts of those who are trying to reform society *solely by political means*.

Much as I am opposed to such efforts, which have the ultimate effect of using the church as an instrument to achieve partisan secular ends, I cannot be too sympathetic to criticisms which come from those laymen who are responsible, at least in part, for this state of affairs.

For, just as the people get the kind of government they demand, so do we laymen get the kind of church we demand. One must admit that, over the years, we have been demanding from our ministers many services which are largely secular. We have burdened them with endless odd jobs, instead of doing those jobs ourselves so they can concentrate on the work which they alone can do — studying, meditating, praying, searching out ways to best meet the deep needs of man's inner life, teaching us by spoken and written word to understand the moral code which should govern our relationships with God and with our neighbors, and the techniques and disciplines for coming to know more of God.

The situation is described in a letter from a father to his son, in which he says: "What does a minister do, my son? Well, his time is his own, which means that he is always on the job. The minister teaches, though he must solicit his own classes. He heals, though without pills or knife. He is sometimes a lawyer, often a social worker, something of an editor, a bit of a philosopher and entertainer, a salesman, a decorative piece for public functions; and he is sup-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed to be a scholar. He visits the sick, marries people, buries the dead, labors to console those who sorrow and to admonish those who sin, and tries to stay sweet when chided for not doing his duty. He plans programs, appoints committees when he can get them, spends considerable time in keeping people out of each other's hair; between times he prepares a sermon and preaches it on Sunday to those who don't happen to have any other engagement. Then on Monday he smiles when some jovial chap roars, 'What a job — one hour a week!' "

The church does have important secular and social duties in a community; and, as an institution, it does have to manage its property, hire labor, and perform many business functions. But some of us have permitted this secular work to supersede the strictly religious functions for which the church exists. So much so that our ministers are warranted in assuming that this is about all we want of our churches. God be thanked that some ministers have not yielded to our demands! There is important work here for laymen. It is to take over many of such business and social functions so that our clergy will be free to minister to our souls!

This raises certain vital questions — Does man have a soul? Is he a spiritual being? Does the cosmic order really sanction his traditional ethical values? Many influential thinkers during the past century have raised doubts. So long as there is such doubt, it paralyzes religious effort in certain directions and has serious political consequences. If it be true, as I maintain, that the idea of liberty and limited government written into our Declaration of Independence and Constitution is founded on religious concepts, then it follows that a decay of this foundation will bring down the political structure erected on it.

In order to see more clearly this relationship between religion and liberty, let us trace the changes in the concepts of the nature of man over the past two centuries. For upon each of these concepts there have been erected corollary political and social doctrines. These, in turn, have influenced the thoughts and actions of those to whom we look for spiritual guidance.

We can divide this era roughly into three periods, the first of which is the classic-liberal period.

Some 200 years ago, classic-liberalism gave us a picture of man as a static creature who had arrived on this planet with fully developed faculties and powers. Among other things, he was endowed with a set of natural rights. On this concept of man there was erected a plan for the ordering of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society. There is much to be commended in the answers to social problems which were derived from this concept. But unfortunately, with the passage of time the advocates of this doctrine failed to give adequate weight to the idea that there must be a religious foundation for political liberty. They were willing to accept the fruits without fully accepting the spiritual source from which they sprang. It appears they did not realize that, cut off from its natural roots in religion, liberty by itself is too fragile a thing to survive very long in this kind of a world.

About the middle of the 19th century the classic-liberal picture of man, which resulted in a large measure of individual freedom and consequent increase in material goods, began to fade. There was evolved a new concept of man. The picture of man as a full-blown static late-comer on earth gave way to the idea that he had developed his faculties by interaction with his physical environment over a very long period of time. The 19th century embraced the materialistic theory of evolution which was attributed to Darwin. The idea of man with inherent rights derived from his Creator had no place in this concept, so it was discarded.

The typical 19th century view of the world was mechanistic. It held that only matter and motion are real; that there was significance only in physical events, that is, events observable by the senses or measurable by physical instruments. *It seemed as though an honest reading of the facts pointed to nature with nothing beyond it, and within nature only things prevailed.*

This view, the proponents said, was supported by the most eminent scientists of the time. Professor Tyndall, in an address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1874, predicted that science would eventually be able to explain everything that had happened and everything that will happen in terms of what he called "the ultimately purely natural and inevitable march of evolution, from the atoms of the primeval nebulae to the proceedings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science." T. H. Huxley, lecturing before the same association, said, "The thoughts to which I am now giving utterance and your thoughts regarding them are expressions of the molecular changes in the matter of life."

BUT EVEN after men had become materialists, they tried to cling to their traditional ethics, although they began to realize that their science and their ethics were in conflict. In 1893 Huxley said, "Social progress means a checking of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another which may be called the ethical process . . ."

Huxley urged an ethic that was opposed to the cosmic order, but his critics said that this was pure sentimentalism and that Huxley was too timid to abandon ethics as he had abandoned the religion from which they had sprung. His ethics, they said, had both feet planted firmly in mid-air, because the ethical process cannot survive without cosmic sanction.

This 19th century concept of man and the universe was not congenial to the idea of human liberty. The political idea of liberty or limited government springs from the religious idea of the character of man. So, when men came to be regarded as mere particles of matter, fragments of the natural landscape, the idea of limited government made little sense.

The real exploiter of this new concept of man and the universe was Marxism. The Marxist dogma that all history is the history of class struggle fits in perfectly with the theory that struggle for existence and natural selection are the only forces that have molded all living forms, including man. *Socialism became the bold and virile new doctrine which has had such strong attraction for many intellectuals from that time until recently.*

Wherever this belief took hold, that only matter and motion are real, serious interest in religion reached a low ebb. What effect did these new and "progressive" ideas have on the church?

In mid-19th century two Church of England clergymen, F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley, men of highest character, founded the Christian Socialist Movement. In America, the Social Gospel Movement was inaugurated shortly after the Civil War. What should churchmen do if they wanted to be effective among a people who were coming more and more to believe that the spiritual world and the human soul were unreal? It seemed at least to some of them that religion's new function was to reform the social order and thus provide currently useful channels for religious energies which formerly had been directed toward man's search for God. They seemed to agree with the thesis that one can change man — all of man, including his soul — merely by changing his physical environment. Certainly no one would contend that man's environment did not need improvement. It still does. But the denial of spiritual reality would appear not to be the way to improve material conditions.

Such, in brief outline, was the period of theoretical materialism— the age of the grand plans for revolutionary social action!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUT SOMETHING happened to the scientific foundations of this 19th century concept of nature and man. A new generation of scientists was coming along. New knowledge of the composition of matter was being obtained. Many eminent scientists were beginning to doubt the thesis that only matter and motion are real. They were taking a new look and were reaching new conclusions.

Let me quote from four contemporary scientists to illustrate this point. Sir James Jeans said in 1930, "Thirty years ago we thought, or assumed, that we were heading toward an ultimate reality of a mechanical kind. It seemed to consist of a fortuitous jumble of atoms which was destined to perform meaningless dances for a time under the action of blind, purposeless forces and then fall back to form a dead world. Into this wholly mechanical world, through the play of the same blind forces, life had stumbled by accident.

"Today there is a wide measure of agreement which, on the physical side of science, approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward a non-mechanical reality. The universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine . . .

"We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds . . ."

Robert A. Millikan stated at about the same time, "The idea that God . . . is not a being of caprice and whim, as had been the case in all the main body of thinking of the ancient world, but is instead a God who rules through law. . . . That idea has made modern science and it is unquestionably the foundation of modern civilization . . ."

Arthur H. Compton said in 1946, "In their essence there can be no conflict between science and religion. Science is a reliable method of finding truth. Religion is the search for a satisfying basis for life. . . . Science is growing. Yet a world that has science needs, as never before, the inspiration that religion has to offer. . . . Beyond the nature taught by science is the spirit that gives meaning to life."

And Albert Einstein said, "God is not playing dice with the universe."

From these and other noted students of the physical universe we learn that matter is not ultimately real; that it is composed of atoms which, in turn, are formed of electrons and protons, i.e., particles of electricity, plus non-charged particles called neutrons, all of which can be transformed into energy which is itself ethereal. It now appears that the ultimate reality is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Spiritual — that something which is both inherent in nature and beyond nature. *The supernatural has been reinstated!* This new scientific world view is of great significance for religion. It reinforces the traditional religious concept of reality and of man. And this new status of religion, in turn, vitally affects social thought.

I HAVE pointed out that the typical social thought of the 19th century was the socialism erected on the foundation of theoretical materialism. We have noted how Huxley clung to a code of ethics after the religious foundation of that code had been removed. In like manner, those who wish to turn men's idealism into socialistic channels still cling to their socializing efforts after the world picture from which their socialism sprang has been erased by the scientists. Professor Wilhelm Roepke, the noted Swiss economist, has stated, "While politics today noisily thrash the sheaves of the 19th century, the soil has already been planted with new seeds." The socializers have now become those with both feet planted firmly in mid-air! *With the disappearance of its materialistic foundation, socialism as a consistent theoretical system is in its death throes,* although the dismembered body is still thrashing about and doing great damage. *The heirs to this defunct philosophy are now using it solely as a means to achieve political power.*

WE ARE now living in the third or post-materialistic period, the period of the emergent-spiritual man. The new concept of man pictures him neither as a static, fully-developed creature, nor as solely the product of material forces. He has developed in response to a non-material, as well as a material environment. He can rise to much higher grades of consciousness, if only he is free to seek his destiny. To do this he must have understanding of his interdependent relationship to his fellow men, a relationship based on his personal awareness of moral responsibility, and not achieved, as the socialists would have it, by group coercion. This concept of the emergent-spiritual man is founded on religion because it pictures individual life as a grand adventure in destiny.

As opposed to the thesis of the socialist partisans that man can be molded completely by his environment, we, who believe that all power comes from God, hold that *man can be changed only if he re-orients himself toward God.* The late Dean Inge said, "In direct opposition to Marxian socialism, we are taught that from within, out of the heart of man, comes all that can exalt or defile him."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where lies the duty of the church in this new age of man?

I do not agree with those who say that the church should have no interest in political or economic problems; for God is everywhere, and where God is, there belongs His church. But there is a vast difference between the church going into politics and the church exerting its great moral influence in the solution of the economic and social problems of mankind. I have support for this view from eminent churchmen. The late Dean Inge declared: "No church ever goes into politics without coming out badly smirched. . . . We have seen the English church in the 18th and part of the 19th centuries identifying itself too much with the landed interest and showing small sympathy with the efforts of landworkers to secure conditions of civilized life. And now, when power has definitely passed into the hands of the masses, we see large numbers of churchmen repeating the same mistake under color of rectifying it. . . . It is notorious that political christianity excites bitter hatred against the church. . . . The choice for the church is between political power and moral influence."

And the late Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, an outstanding leader of the social gospel forces and friendly to Britain's Labor Party said: "It is of crucial importance that the church, acting corporately, should not commit itself to any particular policy. . . . The church is committed to the everlasting Gospel and to the creeds which formulate it; it must never commit itself to an ephemeral program of detailed action."

I HAVE no quarrel with the *stated ends* of modern "liberals" of the left, nor with those of "conservatives" of the right. My concern is with the means advocated, or used, to achieve those ends. *For I believe that the moral content of the ends is inherent in the means used to attain them.* My quarrel is with those who would use force, applied through their agent — government — to achieve social, or any other, objectives. Here, I believe, lies the great mission of the church — *to teach man that by God's power all worthy objectives can be achieved; that to know God — to know His will — should be the highest purpose of man's life! And that man can be oriented toward God only by conversion, which gains the consent of his will — not by coercion, which overrides his will!*

We are now locked in the grip of Armageddon — the death struggle between conversion and coercion, which will determine whether man can learn to obey God's laws in time to avoid destruction; whether an emergent individual morality, but-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tressed by strength derived from God, with resultant power to establish a true religious community, shall be the victor over a decadent group morality, imposed on mankind by the force of secular law. Men are yearning for the things which only a dynamic, militant, creative church can give them — they know now that "Man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things that he hath," that, if they would preserve those precious things which they would hand down as a heritage to their children, *freedom and faith*, they must "seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness," and then, all other things "shall be added unto" them.

My plea is that we so direct our efforts that all men will know when we cry out, "Back to church," we are proclaiming also "Forward to God."

Admiral Ben Moreell is Chairman of the Board of Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation.

RELIGION AT WORK

The Kingdom of God is a kingdom of productive power at work, and not a kingdom of aesthetic self-indulgence or emotional happiness, much less a kingdom of mere talk. It therefore requires no mystical interpretation to give credence to the promise of prosperity to those who seek first the Kingdom of Heaven. Neither does it require any miracle to bring about the literal fulfillment of the promise that other things will be added unto them, for that result would come about through the normal working of economic law. When all the latent energy of a people is made active, when it is directed in the most intelligent manner toward the satisfaction of real human needs, when none of it is wasted or dissipated in injurious, antagonistic or destructive effort, such a people will attain to a degree of real prosperity hitherto unknown.

The greatest resource of any country is its fund of human energy. Nations have grown rich in the midst of poor surroundings by economizing and utilizing their funds of human energy. New England, for example, has poor soil, a harsh climate and no minerals. In spite of these handicaps, the Puritans built a prosperous community. The Mormons in Utah made the desert bloom and blossom. These results were achieved by the development of human resources. Other peoples have grown or remained poor in the midst of rich natural resources because they have not developed their human resources. Russia and China are examples. . . .

The church that discovers and develops all the talent that exists among its young people will be a powerful factor in national prosperity. It will not only help those young people whom it speeds on their way to success, but the rest of the country besides. If it could develop a few great captains of industry, it would help industry to expand, to create more goods and services for more people and more jobs for workers. THOMAS NIXON CARVER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom In Transactions

Frederic Bastiat

In 1848, a French legislator tried to tell his countrymen how the God-given self-interest of each person benefits the welfare of the group

On entering Paris, which I had come to visit, I said to myself — Here are a million of human beings who would all die in a short time if provisions of every kind ceased to flow towards this great metropolis. Imagination is baffled when it tries to appreciate the vast multiplicity of commodities which must enter tomorrow through the barriers in order to preserve the inhabitants from falling a prey to the convulsions of famine, rebellion and pillage. And yet all sleep at this moment, and their peaceful slumbers are not disturbed for a single instant by the prospect of such a frightful catastrophe. On the other hand, eighty departments have been labouring to-day, without concert, without any mutual understanding, for the provisioning of Paris. How does each succeeding day bring what is wanted, nothing more, nothing less, to so gigantic a market? What, then, is the ingenious and secret power which governs the astonishing regularity of movements so complicated, a regularity in which everybody has implicit faith, although happiness and life itself are at stake? That power is an absolute principle, the principle of freedom in transactions. We have faith in that inward light which Providence has placed in the heart of all men, and to which He has confided the preservation and indefinite amelioration of our species, namely a regard to personal interest — since we must give it its right name — a principle so active, so vigilant, so foreseeing, when it is free in its action. In what situation, I would ask, would the inhabitants of Paris be if a minister should take it into his head to substitute for this power the combinations of his own genius, however superior we might suppose them to be — if he thought to subject to his supreme direction this prodigious mechanism, to hold the springs of it in his hands, to decide by whom, or in what manner, or on what conditions, everything needed should be produced, transported, exchanged and consumed? Truly,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there may be much suffering within the walls of Paris — poverty, despair, perhaps starvation, causing more tears to flow than ardent charity is able to dry up; but I affirm that it is probable, nay, that it is certain, that the arbitrary intervention of government would multiply infinitely those sufferings, and spread over all our fellow-citizens those evils which at present affect only a small number of them.

This extract is from *Social Fallacies*, Register Publishing Company edition, 1944.

FORCE OR REASON

Do you not see, first, that — as a mental abstract — physical force is directly opposed to morality; and, secondly, that it practically drives out of existence the moral forces? How can an act done under compulsion have any moral element in it, seeing that what is moral is the free act of an intelligent being? If you tie a man's hands there is nothing moral about his not committing murder. Such an abstaining from murder is a mechanical act; and just the same in kind, though less in degree, are all the acts which men are compelled to do under penalties imposed upon them by their fellow-men. Those who would drive their fellow-men into the performance of any good actions do not see that the very elements of morality — the free act following on the free choice — are as much absent in those upon whom they practice their legislation as in a flock of sheep penned in by hurdles. You cannot see too clearly that force and reason — which last is the essence of the moral act — are at the two opposite poles. When you act by reason you are not acting under the compulsion of other men; when you act under compulsion you are not acting under the guidance of reason. The one is a force within you and the other is a force without. Moreover, physical force in a man's hand is an instrument of such brutal character that its very nature destroys and excludes the kindlier or better qualities of human nature. The man who compels his neighbor is not the man who reasons with and convinces him, who seeks to influence him by example, who rouses him to make exertions to save himself. AUBERON HERBERT (1838-1906)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Farm Problem

M. H. Banner

A County Agent fears that the farmers' acceptance of subsidies will be used by government as proof that it has thereby acquired the right to control their lands

WASHINGTON is again ringing with debate about the farm program and changes that ought to be made in it.

That is good. The program is far from perfect. Much of the compromise behind it was due to politics, and for a while there seemed to be more concern about who was to blame for the dip in farm prices than what should be done about it.

If the signs mean anything, much the same kind of a storm is brewing just ahead. Many of the arguments we will hear in the next few months will have a familiar ring.

Let's take a quick look at some new ideas on the subject. As county agent, my work is with people, primarily farm people. The words are mine but the ideas are theirs.

I AM CONCERNED — and rightfully so, I think — not so much with the farm program itself as with its effect, its impact on the lives and livelihood of the people I work with.

That's why I am disturbed. If anybody had told me 25 years ago that today's farmer would need permission to sell wheat and the sheep men would be lined up for a check from the U. S. Treasury, I'd have said he was dreaming. Strange to say, the situation is apparently accepted by most of our people.

Although violently disagreeing with the principle involved, an ever-increasing segment of our people act as though they believed the government should guarantee success to everyone, especially to them.

This attitude is largely because our recent national prosperity was accompanied by an increasing amount of government control.

We're confusing cause and effect. As a result, more and more people clamor for reservations on the gravy train.

This article, under the title "The Wrong Track?" was first printed in *The Prairie Farmer*, February 19, 1955.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just yesterday I got a letter from a farm wife who asked, "Why isn't the price of eggs supported? My husband sells corn and wheat on a government market."

In my answer, I pointed out that she could probably do more to solve her egg-marketing problem than the government could. And finally, if all else fails, she didn't have to stay in the egg business. Or if, as she says, "The margin is too wide between what we get and what the consumer pays," then why doesn't she get into the egg-handling business? It is still a free country, isn't it?

I don't think she liked my answer any more than a child likes to be told there is no Santa Claus. And for the same reason: Uncle Sam has been Santa to so many other people, why shouldn't he be Santa to her?

Her letter raised this question, in effect: If the government is going to support prices on anything, shouldn't it do so on everything?

Price support arguments usually start a whole chain of fuzzy thinking. Talk to anyone who is *for* price supports and right away he says something like this: "Look at all the help labor and other groups get from Uncle Sam. Why shouldn't the farmer get his cut?"

He admits that the government shouldn't be helping anybody but then he turns right around and asks for help himself. Such reasoning is dangerous. Two wrongs do not make a right. If other groups are getting more than their share from the government, let's lower the boom on them.

Another argument we heard during the recent election campaign was: "Farmers are going broke." Sure they are. Free men will always go broke. Businessmen and farmers alike are going broke — and for the same reason: The principle of competition and free enterprise are at work. The least efficient are losing out. Is that bad?

Would we make much progress if we reward the poor worker the same as the good? Should the government help either a poor farmer or barber, when most of his trouble is caused by his own lack of skill or by business factors within his control?

Good farmers are making money — real money, by following the best practices and doing a good job of management. They have enlarged on their opportunities and are using to the full their unequaled educational and service advantages.

The good farmer is also a good thinker. He knows that to help anyone who is not doing his best is to destroy initiative and lower effi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciency. Did the dairyman cull out the low-producing cow when he had a high guaranteed price?

So much for price supports. What about Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP) payments? Are they a curse or a cure? Are they "of great value in getting the farmer to adopt better methods"? Or do they merely keep him in the harness while he drags agriculture down toward the peasant level?

At best, these payments are poor public relations. Labor and other nonfarm groups look at the total cost to the taxpayer and yell loudly. They fail to realize that out of the dollars which the program costs only pennies ever get into the farmer's pocket. Yet farmers are blamed for the whole bill.

The effect of the payments, if not their purpose, is to divert attention from the fact that the farm program has failed miserably to solve the basic ills of agriculture. ACP payments confuse the issue, muddy the water. They treat the symptom rather than the disease.

Still worse, they befuddle farmers and divide them until they no longer agree on what their trouble really is.

The worst feature is that it questions a farmer's honesty or his sanity. The application forms contain a statement that the farmer would not carry out the listed conservation practices without federal aid. Let's take a closer look at this.

Popular projects on the docket here in Illinois are the "initial" application of lime and rock phosphate. "Initial" means that these are new practices, that they have not been used before under the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) program. Since they change the name every year or so (it used to be AAA, PMA, etc.), it is easy for a farmer to say he has never used lime before (under ASC), even though that particular field may have been limed twice or more under some previous program.

How can lime and phosphate be thought of as *new* practices, when we've known about them and the good results possible from their proper use, for so many years? Research has shown that, where they are needed, their use will return about 15 to 1 on the investment; that is, every dollar spent will return 15. Knowing this — and it is common knowledge among farmers who read or talk or listen to the radio — how can any farmer truthfully say he wouldn't use lime or phosphate?

How can he sign the required statement without making himself out either a fool or a liar? Yes, those are two bad words. But the situation I described in using them is even worse. And it has government sanction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT DOES it do to a farmer — deep down inside — to have his arm twisted in such a way just to get a few dollars for something he knows darned well he would do anyway? What will he shut his eyes to next? Where will all this sort of thing end?

I am not a student of political science. But I believe that every ACP check a farmer endorses will some day be used against him as evidence that he agrees the government has an interest in his land and therefore a right to some control over its use. Thus every check becomes a milestone on the road to socialism — government ownership of land and productive wealth.

STEP BY STEP, we're getting in deeper all the time, yet each succeeding step comes easier. Like the fish that can't resist the fancy lure, the farmer is veritably hooking himself.

We'd like to ask: Will the hook always be baited? Or will the time come when the government will tell the farmer what to do? How long will it be before the sugar coating is replaced by a mailed fist?

Finally — let's face it — government giveaway programs, if that's what they are, will always help the nonfarmer more than the farmer simply because the farmer is outnumbered six to one at the polls. There are more nonfarmers than farmers, and we can recognize the political implications of that fact as we see the farmer squeezed today between rising costs and falling prices in a manipulated market.

The solution is not to further subsidize the farmer but to cut down on aid to the nonfarmer.

It has been said — and I agree — that the true effect of the farm program has been obscured by the false prosperity created by the war and the threat of war. Many people think otherwise; they believe that the recent good years enjoyed by agriculture were due to the farm program of those years.

Surely the latter is not true, for we are almost as far from a solution to the basic problems as ever. Like the squirrel in a cage, we're on a treadmill, always in motion, but getting nowhere.

DO FARMERS honestly believe they should be paid by Uncle Sam for farming well? Or, that they should be guaranteed a measure of success enjoyed by no other member of our society? Won't good farming pay for itself, if the farmer puts both hands to the plow, rather than having one hand outstretched toward Washington?

There is no doubt of the need for well-planned farm operations, including proper land use. Still, only about one farm out of ten is farmed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with sound conservation measures in mind, simply because high price supports for crops like corn and wheat encourage a farmer to deplete his land. Such governmental intervention bribes farmers to engage in a kind of capital depletion which is known to be poor business practice.

Instead of trying to repair the old 1930 model — at best, a patchwork version of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) — why not try a new kind of farm program? Why not restore some dignity and respect to agriculture, by letting the owner and manager of each farm business plan his own program of efficient production and wise land-use? If it is vital to this nation to have a continuing abundance of food and fiber, then it seems high time that we let the planning be done by individuals who have proven their desire and their capacity to make their own way in the highly competitive business of successful farming.

FARMERS OPPOSE HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS

A questionnaire asking an opinion of the flexible price support law enacted by Congress in August, 1954 — and also asking if the recipient "would prefer no price support law" — was submitted to 1,087 representative farmers in all parts of Indiana during September. Answers from 947, or 87 per cent, were received by the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association.

Of those answering, 36.3 per cent favored the flexible support law, which provides that the staple crops can be supported at 82.5 to 90 per cent of parity in 1955 and 75 to 90 per cent thereafter; 31.6 per cent opposed this law, indicating their preference for more rigid supports at higher levels. A similar questionnaire sent out by the co-op researchers in May, 1953, found 38.8 per cent favoring fixed, high supports, while 17.7 per cent stood for flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 per cent of parity.

Thus it is evident that the number of farmers favoring the flexible principle more than doubled in fifteen months.

Further, the September questionnaire showed that 17.8 per cent of the farmers "would prefer no price supports" at all. When this number is added to those favoring flexible supports, it is clear that well over half the farmers of the Hoosier state stand for free or substantially free markets for their products. Less than a third want the government to prop their prices at high levels. OSCAR W. COOLEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Machines Mean More Jobs

Benjamin F. Fairless

NEARLY THREE centuries ago, an inventor in Danzig built a loom that could weave six webs at once, and the authorities promptly suppressed it in order to protect the poor. But the "poor" were not appeased. They wanted no more such machines. So they seized the hapless inventor and drowned him in a nearby creek.

Then at the outset of the so-called industrial revolution in England, mobs of angry workers broke into the mills and tried to destroy the new automatic machinery which they feared would leave them jobless. And in those days, of course, such fears were entirely understandable. Since a machine did the work of many men, it was only natural to suppose that it would destroy the livelihood of an equal number of men. But it didn't, as we know.

Today, from our vantage point in history, we can look back upon those early times and read the truth: That it was the machine alone which enabled England to support her rapidly growing population and provide it with a rising standard of living. In countries like India and China, where mechanization did not occur, the standard of living fell far below subsistence levels, and the population was decimated by starvation and disease.

So machines and tools have proved, beyond doubt, to be the greatest single source of man's material welfare; but his fear of them has persisted, right down to the present day, and some of you will recall that about twenty-five or thirty years ago such fears were widely prevalent here in the United States.

IN THOSE DAYS, one of the popular plays on Broadway was a thing called "R. U. R.," and it brought the word *robot* into our language. That word frightened us for quite awhile. Technological unemployment became the subject of national debate — both in and out of Washington. An economic school of thought, known as *Technocracy*, enjoyed widespread publicity. And later on, a gentleman who is still a member of the United States Senate publicly declared that "Science and invention are to blame for the present unemployment in America!"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the American people refused to accept this fatal philosophy of fear; and this was fortunate indeed, because most military experts now agree, I believe, that the decisive battles of World War II were fought and won on the production lines of American industry. They were won because American investors continued courageously to pour their savings into the best available tools of production; and because American labor had the wisdom and the skill to use those facilities to the greatest possible advantage.

Yet today, the same old blind, unreasoning fear of machines is reappearing among us; and the most curious thing about this new campaign of propaganda is that we are being frightened — not by the advance of technology itself — but once again by a strange new word that few of us understand. This time the word is *automation* instead of *robot*, but it means just about the same thing.

Among the engineers who coined it, the word automation is merely a term which conveniently describes certain mechanical controls and processes. There is nothing frightening about it, nor is there anything basically new about the mechanical principles to which it applies.

But to thousands of our people who do not understand its meaning, it suggests a brand new class of machines — different from any which we have ever had before — and so superior to man himself that, ultimately, they may rise, like Frankenstein's monster, to destroy us all. Thus the word alone is enough to conjure up visions of a wholly-automatic factory where machines with super-brains will grind out products, 168 hours a week, without any human payroll whatever.

And these fears, of course, are just plain silly. There are no such factories and no such machines; nor will there ever be, either in my time or yours! But propaganda is a powerful thing; and it is growing louder.

A RECENT headline in a New York newspaper says: "Automation Putting Humans in Outfield." And statements from some of our labor leaders are even more alarming. They demand that the government set up a vast welfare program to relieve the suffering that they think automation will bring. They also declare that automation must be offset by a guaranteed annual wage, which would presumably impose heavy penalties on the installation of labor-saving devices and thus retard all technological progress in America.

So automation has become a menacing word — a kind of mod-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern bogey-man with which to frighten our people. And as I say, it is proving effective. A few months ago, the Public Opinion Index took a poll among more than a thousand factory workers, and asked them two questions: First, did they favor the use of more new and *improved* machines. They did, by about three to one. Then they were asked how they felt about more automation. But they opposed that, three to two!

Yet the two things, of course, are really identical. There is nothing new about automation except the word itself. The facts of automation — and the mechanics of it — are older than our own American Republic.

BACK IN 1784, before our Constitutional government was established, a man named Oliver Evans went out to the banks of Red Clay Creek near Philadelphia, and built a flour mill that was just about as automatic as any mill can be. A system of conveyors, run by water power, picked up the grain, carried it through all the grinding operations, and delivered the finished flour. But when an auto manufacturer in Detroit builds a plant which handles engine blocks in exactly the same manner, we think it's something new, and it worries us.

Nowadays, too, we marvel at the modern business machine which writes checks and keeps records through the use of punch-cards. And on our production lines are other wonderful machines which are automatically controlled by a punched paper tape. But is this really new? Oh, not at all.

More than 150 years ago, a Frenchman named Jacquard built an automatic loom which wove all kinds of complicated patterns in accordance with instructions that were also punched in paper. And that invention was not suppressed by the authorities. Eleven thousand such looms were set up in France alone!

Then there is still another form of automation which is described in the jargon of my fellow engineers by such mystifying words as *servo-mechanisms* and the *feedback principle*. But we've had all those alarming things right in our own homes ever since we first installed a thermostat to regulate the furnace! We've even had *automated* music in the form of the player-piano; and as George Gobel would say: "You can't hardly find them no more, these days!"

So let's face it: This thing called automation is simply evolution — not revolution. It is only another little step in the slow and plodding progress of man towards a richer, fuller life, and a better, freer world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OVER THE CENTURIES man has accomplished an amazing industrial miracle. He has surrounded himself with luxuries, and greatly lengthened his hours of leisure; but no machine that he ever devised has made us humans obsolete.

Suppose we think for a moment of the three outstanding examples of automation that we have seen in our lifetime:

The first one that comes to mind, probably, is the dial telephone. We would naturally assume that it must have thrown thousands of telephone operators out of work; and some of the current propaganda on the subject would seem to confirm that assumption completely. But what are the facts?

Well, the latest federal census, taken in 1950, shows that the number of telephone operators in this country increased by 159,000, or 79 per cent, in the previous ten years. And still the Telephone Company keeps on advertising for more!

Then next we come to business machines and these fabulous new electronic brains that we've seen on television. Surely we don't need accountants any more. But still the census shows that the number of accountants and auditors increased 71 per cent in this same ten-year period.

And how about these so-called automatic factories in Detroit, where the word *automation* was thought up? Are the automobile workers losing out? Well, not by a long shot. Their number doubled in fourteen years. Automobile mechanics and repairmen have increased 75 per cent. And for every new job in the auto industry it is estimated that five new jobs are created in allied fields which supply the raw materials and components that go into the manufacture and equipment of new cars.

But this, of course, is not always the case in every industry and every occupation. Dislocations do occur in some instances, and men do have to change from one job to another. That has been true in farming for nearly 40 years. With the falling demand for coal, employment in the mines has also dropped off substantially, and there is recent evidence of a mild decline in oil refining, for example.

NOW WHERE are these men to go? Has automation made it tougher for them than it used to be? Let's look at the picture as a whole and see for ourselves just what really has happened in the last fifteen years or so — say from 1939 through 1953. Well, here are the facts:

During this period the population of the United States has increased 22 per cent. But the total

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of jobs has grown by 35 per cent — or more than half again as much. And in the field of manufacturing itself — where automation has advanced most rapidly — employment has gone up 73 per cent, or more than three times as fast as the population.

The record clearly shows moreover, that this rapid increase in employment has occurred chiefly because of mechanization — not in spite of it! The building of machines themselves — plus their installation, maintenance and the construction of new factories to house them — has opened up thousands of job opportunities that never existed before.

Employment in the field of electrical machinery, for example, has more than trebled during this period. In other machinery it has increased by 150 per cent. And in the specialized field of automation itself, the mere manufacture of the necessary instruments of measurement and control has mushroomed into a three-billion-dollar business which already employs as many men as the auto industry did in the middle 1930's.

But that is only the beginning. As mechanization has enlarged the output and the purchasing power of our people, it has also multiplied enormously their demand for services. So they, in their turn, employ more doctors and dentists, more engineers and scientists, and more teachers and clergymen. They send out more of their laundry, and they eat more often in restaurants. Even the fact that they have more leisure time has created more jobs for others. Employment in tourist courts and camps has more than tripled. Theaters, movies, amusement parks and similar establishments provide 75 per cent more jobs than formerly. The purchase of books has doubled, and expenditures for home music have trebled. And so it goes. Employment in the service industries alone has risen by more than two million during these 14 years. And that is a jump of 65 per cent.

The same thing has happened, too, in the general field of trade. As the volume of production has increased, it has taken more workers to sell and to handle these goods. And thus, six million new jobs have been opened up by the growing employment demands of department stores, shops, offices, builders, bankers, utilities, bus lines, trucking companies, and others in this category.

And finally, of course, our advance in technology has created whole new industries, and vast new fields of opportunity, in television, antibiotics, air conditioning, many new branches of electronics, and now, in atomic energy — just to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mention a few. So with each passing year, and with every new invention, our people have a wider choice of jobs; and today, it is reported that there are more than forty thousand different ways whereby Americans can earn a living!

But suppose, for example, that all technological progress in the auto industry had stopped back in 1908, and that we were to try to build a 1955 car, at today's wages, with the tools and machines we used then. Such a car, if it could be produced at all, would cost well in excess of $65,000! How many cars would there be on the road? And how many roads would we have? How many jobs would there be in Detroit, and in the oil fields, and in the tire-making industry — or even in our steel mills for that matter? Why, millions of our workers would be idle, and America would rank among the so-called backward nations of the world — provided, of course, that we had been able to survive at all as a free and independent people.

So the time has come, I think, to nail this vicious propaganda for the miserable fraud that it is. The facts show that only through the widest possible use of new and better machines can we hope to achieve the fullest measure of employment and a higher standard of living.

And while we are at this business of nailing, let's tackle another dangerous deception that the busy propagandists are perpetrating these days: That is the charge that the greedy owners of industry have grabbed the lion's share of the fruits of technology, while the workers have been robbed of the rightful rewards of their mounting, mechanized production.

NOW FORTUNATELY, the true facts of this matter are readily available in a study which was made by Allen W. Rucker, and published by the Eddy-Rucker-Nickels Company of Cambridge, Massachusetts. This study covers the 33-year period from 1914 to 1947 — a whole generation during which the two great wars of this century were fought, and when American industry was undoubtedly making some of the most important and fundamental technological progress in its history. Moreover, Mr. Rucker's analysis is based entirely on the United States Census of Manufactures and other official government reports; so I do not suppose that anyone will challenge the authenticity of the facts which he presents. And this is what they show:

They show that on a man-hour basis, over this entire period, the output of the men and machines in American manufacturing as a whole increased by 161 per cent;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the real wages of the workers, measured in terms of purchasing power, increased 157 per cent, and that the relative prices of manufactured products, measured in terms of hourly wages, declined 61 per cent.

IN ITS FINDINGS, therefore, the report states that the real wages of the worker have advanced "at almost exactly the same rate as the improvement in productivity." It adds that under the American system of manufacturing, the advance in such wages "depends wholly upon advances in productivity." And it declares, in conclusion, that the manufacturing industry on the whole has passed on to its customers and employees "virtually all the 'savings' from increased productivity" — that rarely, and only temporarily, have the owners retained any gains whatever from this source.

And in further support of Mr. Rucker's statements, I should like to call your attention to one additional fact which is not contained in his report: That back in 1914, the share of the national income which went to the owners of business in the form of dividends was about six per cent; but in 1947, their share amounted only to about three per cent. So over this 33-year period, the owners who put up the money for all the machines that made increased production possible, found that their slice of our total economic pie had been cut approximately in half.

IT MAY WELL be asked, of course, why industry continues to spend billions of dollars upon the development and purchase of improved machines if its owners receive no direct gains from these expenditures. And the answer to that, as we know, is all bound up in one simple and compelling word: *competition.*

When any business in America fails to keep its plants modern, and thus allows its more efficient competitors to undersell its products in the market place, then that business is on the way out. Unless it can recover its lost ground quickly, it is through. The money that its owners have invested in it will be largely wiped out — and so, of course, will the jobs of all of its employees.

So in a very important sense, technological improvement is simply the process by which we protect, not only the investment of the owners, but also the job security of every industrial worker.

Benjamin F. Fairless is Chairman of the Board of United States Steel Corporation. This article is extracted from an address titled "Our One Indispensable Weapon," February 11, 1955.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Loyalty Oaths

Leonard E. Read

Is there any logic in passing a law which states that one person *must* be loyal to another person? Isn't that about the same thing as threatening to use force to make one person love another person? *Can* it be done?

Our government now demands that its citizens in various capacities swear that they will be loyal — in all things and at all times — to this government. Is there any logic at all in such a demand?

The American colonists, as members of the British Empire, were subjects of Great Britain. George III demanded loyalty of them. Should they have respected these demands? Without question, if one accepts the principle of undeviating loyalty, of constant and perpetual assent, then tyranny and evil can have no stopping place. In any event, the colonists did turn disloyal to the Mother Country. They were so serious about it that they used guns to express their disloyal convictions. Not only was the U.S.A. born in acts of disloyalty to an oppressor, but disloyalty to future oppressors was adopted as a fundamental principle, for in the Declaration of Independence itself is this admonition:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — *That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government,* laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. (Italics added.)

Were these actions of the colonists right or wrong? The answer comes clear when the proper questions are posed. Does one owe loyalty to a spouse turned unfaithful? Does one owe loyalty to a government turned socialist or communist? The answer is final when one sees that loyalty is not a condition that can be imposed but, in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stead, is an attitude that can only be earned. As Frederic Bastiat phrased it: "The safest way to make laws respected is to make them respectable."

LOYALTY, like love, is a personal response on the part of others to one's own pleasing, agreeable, acceptable behaviours. It is a response and nothing else. Quite true, it is a hoped-for response. But simply because it is desirable does not signify that it can be insured by fiat or edict. As the reading on a thermometer is but a recording of heat, so is the degree of loyalty but a recording of feelings in the human heart toward the behaviour and actions of others. To attempt the fixing of either one, without regard to the conditions from which they spring, is to act absurdly. The most that can be said is this: If one wishes loyalty in another, let him inspire it by actions the other considers both efficacious and just. This applies to government as well as to persons.

The confusion in the loyalty question appears to arise from a semantic difficulty. There is a quality a person has a right to expect of another, a quality which if conspicuously absent in the citizenry makes any proper government impossible. That quality is integrity; its opposite is two-facedness — such as, claiming loyalty to one's spouse while practicing infidelity in his or her absence; affecting friendship in the presence of another while acting unfriendly when the other's back is turned; espousing free enterprise when in the company of free enterprisers and going along with the socialists when a little government pap appears expedient; accepting the privileges of citizenship in one's country while secretly serving as the agent of a foe. The Judases, the two-facers, the double-dealers are cases in point.

When we reduce the evil so loosely termed "disloyalty" to the real evil "two-facedness," it becomes quite apparent how little in the way of effacing it can be accomplished by either legislation or public oaths. Penalties can be imposed for perjury and the government can discharge any person who is not properly doing whatever he was hired to do. That about states the limits of what legislation can accomplish. But this will not greatly deter the person who desires to deceive. In his case, oaths tell nothing.

IN FACT, oaths may well be worse than useless. Two-facedness, for instance, is part and parcel of the Moscow-apparatus credo. Dishonesty, misrepresentation, dissimulation, are actually *marks of virtue* according to communist standards.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These vile vices are rungs in the ladder of all power-politics schemes — acknowledged by communist schemers; denied by other schemers; practiced by all of them.

PUBLIC OATHS give the deceitful the chance to publicize their false faces while they more safely hide their true faces. And public oaths exacted from persons of integrity are obviously senseless and serve no real purpose at all.

To demand loyalty is to acknowledge a failure to earn it. Any person or institution, government or whatever, that attempts to exact or demand loyalty oaths hangs out a banner with either "sickness" or "weakness" written all over it.

For God's sake do not drag me into another war! I am worn down, and worn out, with crusading and defending Europe, and protecting mankind; I must think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards — I am sorry for the Greeks — I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Bagdad is oppressed — I do not like the present state of the Delta — Thibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid that the consequence will be, that we shall cut each other's throats. No war, dear Lady Grey! — no eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic! I beseech you, secure Lord Grey's swords and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armor. SYDNEY SMITH, Letter to Lady Grey, February 19, 1823

There is more of misery inflicted upon mankind by one year of war than by all the civil peculations and oppressions in a century. Yet it is a state into which the mass of mankind rush with a greatest avidity, hailing official murderers, in scarlet, gold, and cock's feathers, as the greatest and most glorious of human creatures. SYDNEY SMITH, 1813

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Is A Libertarian?

Dean Russell

THOSE OF US who favor individual freedom with personal responsibility have been unable to agree upon a generally acceptable name for ourselves and our philosophy of liberty. This would be relatively unimportant except for the fact that the opposition will call us by some name, even though we might not desire to be identified by any name at all. Since this is so, we might better select a name with some logic instead of permitting the opposition to saddle us with an epithet.

Some of us call ourselves "individualists," but others point out that the opposition often uses that word to describe a heartless person who doesn't care about the problems and aspirations of other people.

Some of us call ourselves "conservatives," but that term describes many persons who base their approval of an institution more on its age than on its inherent worth.

Many of us call ourselves "liberals." And it is true that the word "liberal" once described persons who respected the individual and feared the use of mass compulsions. But the leftists have now corrupted that once-proud term to identify themselves and their program of more government ownership of property and more controls over persons. As a result, those of us who believe in freedom must explain that when we call ourselves liberals, we mean liberals in the uncorrupted classical sense. At best, this is awkward and subject to misunderstanding.

HERE IS a suggestion: Let those of us who love liberty trade-mark and reserve for our own use the good and honorable word "libertarian."

Webster's New International Dictionary defines a libertarian as "One who holds to the doctrine of free will; also, one who upholds the principles of liberty, esp. individual liberty of thought and action."

In popular terminology, a libertarian is the opposite of an authoritarian. Strictly speaking, a libertarian is one who rejects the idea of using violence or the threat of violence — legal or illegal — to impose his will or viewpoint upon any peaceful person. Generally speaking, a libertarian is one who wants to be governed far less than he is today.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A libertarian believes that the government should protect all persons equally against external and internal aggression, but should otherwise generally leave people alone to work out their own problems and aspirations.

WHILE A libertarian expects the government to render equal protection to all persons against outright fraud and misrepresentation, he doesn't expect the government to protect anyone from the consequences of his own free choices. A libertarian holds that persons who make wise choices are entitled to enjoy the fruits of their wisdom, and that persons who make unwise choices have no right to demand that the government reimburse them for their folly.

A libertarian expects his government to establish, support, and enforce the decisions of impartial courts of justice — courts which do not recognize or refer to a person's race, religion, or economic status. If justice is to be rendered, the decisions of these courts must be as binding upon government officials and their actions as upon other persons and their actions.

A LIBERTARIAN respects the right of every person to use and enjoy his honestly acquired property — to trade it, to sell it, or even to give it away — for he knows that human liberty cannot long endure when that fundamental right is rejected or even seriously impaired.

A libertarian believes that the daily needs of the people can best be satisfied through the voluntary processes of a free and competitive market. And he holds the strong belief that free persons, using their own honestly acquired money, are in the best possible position to understand and aid their fellow men who are in need of help.

A LIBERTARIAN favors a strictly limited form of government with many checks and balances — and divisions of authority — to foil the abuses of the fearful power of government. And generally speaking, he is one who sees less, rather than more, need to govern the actions of others.

A libertarian has much faith in himself and other free persons to find maximum happiness and prosperity in a society wherein no person has the authority to force any other peaceful person to conform to his viewpoints or desires in any manner. His way of life is based on respect for himself and for all others.

A LIBERTARIAN doesn't advocate violent rebellion against prevailing governments — except as a last resort before the concentration camps. But when a libertarian sees

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harm rather than good in certain acts of government, he is obligated to try his best to explain to others who advocate those measures why such compulsory means cannot bring the ends which even they desire.

The libertarian's goal is friendship and peace with his neighbors at home and abroad.

It is not the difference in taste between individuals that Libertarians object to, but the forcing of one's tastes upon another. CHARLES T. SPRADING

The idea of governing by force another man, who I believe to be my equal in the sight of God, is repugnant to me. I do not want to do it. I do not want any one to govern me by any kind of force. I am a reasoning being, and I only need to be shown what is best for me, when I will take that course or do that thing simply because it is best, and so will you. I do not believe that a soul was ever forced toward anything except toward ruin.

Liberty for the few is not liberty. Liberty for me and slavery for you means slavery for both. SAMUEL M. JONES

The institutions of civil liberty leave each man to run his career in life in his own way, only guaranteeing to him that whatever he does in the way of industry, economy, prudence, sound judgment, etc., shall redound to his welfare and shall not be diverted to someone else's benefit. Of course it is a necessary corollary that each man shall also bear the penalty of his own vices and his own mistakes.

We are told what fine things would happen if every one of us would go and do something for the welfare of somebody else; but why not contemplate also the immense gain which would ensue if everybody would do something for himself?

Wherever collective standards, codes, ideals, and motives take the place of individual responsibility, we know from ample experience that the spontaneity and independent responsibility which are essential to moral vigor are sure to be lost. WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Inequality Of Wealth And Incomes

Ludwig von Mises

Where there is a lower degree of inequality in wealth, there is also a lower average standard of living

THE MARKET ECONOMY — capitalism — is based on private ownership of the material means of production and private entrepreneurship. The consumers by their buying or abstention from buying ultimately determine what should be produced and in what quantity and quality. They render profitable the affairs of those businessmen who best comply with their wishes and unprofitable the affairs of those who do not produce what they are asking for most urgently. Profits convey control of the factors of production into the hands of those who are employing them for the best possible satisfaction of the most urgent needs of the consumers, and losses withdraw them from the control of the inefficient businessmen. In a market economy not sabotaged by the government the owners of property are mandatories of the consumers as it were. On the market a daily repeated plebiscite determines who should own and how much. It is the consumers who make some people rich and other people penniless.

Inequality of wealth and income is an essential feature of the market economy. It is the implement that makes the consumers supreme in giving them the power to force all those engaged in production to comply with their orders. It forces all those engaged in production to the utmost exertion in the service of the consumers. It makes competition work. He who best serves the consumers profits most and accumulates riches.

In a society of the type that Ferguson, Saint Simon and Herbert Spencer called militaristic and present-day Americans call feudal, private property of land was the fruit of violent usurpation or of donations on the part of the conquering warlord. Some people owned more, some less and some nothing because the chieftain had determined it that way. In such a society it was correct to assert that the abundance of the great landowners was the corollary of the indigence of the landless. But it is different in a market economy. Bigness in business does not im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pair, but improves the conditions of the rest of the people. The millionaires are acquiring their fortunes in supplying the many with articles that were previously beyond their reach. If laws had prevented them from getting rich, the average American household would have to forego many of the gadgets and facilities that are today its normal equipment. This country enjoys the highest standard of living ever known in history because for several generations no attempts were made toward "equalization" and "redistribution." Inequality of wealth and incomes is the cause of the masses' well-being, not the cause of anybody's distress. Where there is a "lower degree of inequality," there is necessarily a lower standard of living of the masses.

In the opinion of the demagogues inequality in what they call the "distribution" of wealth and incomes is in itself the worst of all evils. Justice would require an equal distribution. It is therefore both fair and expedient to confiscate the surplus of the rich or at least a considerable part of it and to give it to those who own less. This philosophy tacitly presupposes that such a policy will not impair the total quantity produced. But even if this were true, the amount added to the average man's buying power would be much smaller than extravagant popular illusions assume. In fact the luxury of the rich absorbs only a slight fraction of the nation's total consumption. The much greater part of the rich men's incomes is not spent for consumption, but saved and invested. It is precisely this that accounts for the accumulation of their great fortunes. If the funds which the successful businessmen would have ploughed back into productive employments are used by the state for current expenditure or given to people who consume them, the further accumulation of capital is slowed down or entirely stopped. Then there is no longer any question of economic improvement, technological progress and a trend toward higher average standards of living.

When Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* recommended "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax" and "abolition of all right of inheritance" as measures "to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie," they were consistent from the point of view of the ultimate end they were aiming at, viz., the substitution of socialism for the market economy. They were fully aware of the inevitable consequences of these policies. They openly declared that these measures are "economically untenable" and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that they advocated them only because "they necessitate further inroads" upon the capitalist social order and are "unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production," i.e., as a means of bringing about socialism.

But it is quite a different thing when these measures which Marx and Engels characterized as "economically untenable" are recommended by people who pretend that they want to preserve the market economy and economic freedom. These self-styled middle-of-the-road politicians are either hypocrites who want to bring about socialism by deceiving the people about their real intentions, or they are ignoramuses who do not know what they are talking about. For progressive taxes upon incomes and upon estates are incompatible with the preservation of the market economy.

The middle-of-the-road man argues this way: There is no reason why a businessman should slacken in the best conduct of his affairs only because he knows that his profits will not enrich him but will benefit all people. Even if he is not an altruist who does not care for lucre and unselfishly toils for the common weal, he will have no motive to prefer a less efficient performance of his activities to a more efficient. It is not true, that the only incentive that impels the great captains of industry is acquisitiveness. They are no less driven by the ambition to bring their products to perfection.

This argumentation entirely misses the point. What matters is not the behavior of the entrepreneurs but the supremacy of the consumers. We may take it for granted that the businessmen will be eager to serve the consumers to the best of their abilities even if they themselves do not derive any advantage from their zeal and application. They will accomplish what according to their opinion best serves the consumers. But then it will no longer be the consumers that determine what they have to get. They will have to take what the businessmen believe is best for them. Not the consumers, but the entrepreneurs will be supreme. The consumers will no longer have the power to entrust control of production to those businessmen whose products they like most and to relegate those whose products they appreciate less to a more modest position in the system. If the present American laws concerning the taxation of the profits of corporations, the incomes of individuals and inheritances had been introduced about sixty years ago, all those new products whose consumption has raised the standard of living of the "common man" would either not be produced at all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or only in small quantities for the benefit of a minority. The Ford enterprises would not exist if Henry Ford's profits had been taxed away as soon as they came into being. The business structure of 1895 would have been preserved. The accumulation of new capital would have ceased or at least slowed down considerably. The expansion of production would lag behind the increase of population. There is no need to expatiate about the effects of such a state of affairs.

Profit and loss tell the entrepreneur what the consumers are asking for most urgently. And only the profits the entrepreneur pockets enable him to adjust his activities to the demand of the consumers. If the profits are expropriated, he is prevented from complying with the directives given by the consumers. Then the market economy is deprived of its steering wheel. It becomes a senseless jumble.

PEOPLE CAN consume only what has been produced. The great problem of our age is precisely this: Who should determine what is to be produced and consumed, the people or the State, the consumers themselves or a paternal government? If one decides in favor of the consumers, one chooses the market economy. If one decides in favor of the government, one chooses socialism. There is no third solution. The determination of the purpose for which each unit of the various factors of production is to be employed cannot be divided.

The supremacy of the consumers consists in their power to hand over control of the material factors of production and thereby the conduct of production activities to those who serve them in the most efficient way. This implies inequality of wealth and incomes. If one wants to do away with inequality of wealth and incomes, one must abandon capitalism and adopt socialism. (The question whether any socialist system would really give income equality must be left to an analysis of socialism.)

But, say the middle-of-the-road enthusiasts, we do not want to abolish inequality altogether. We want merely to substitute a lower degree of inequality for a higher degree.

These people look upon inequality as upon an evil. They do not assert that a definite degree of inequality which can be exactly determined by a judgment free of any arbitrariness and personal evaluation is good and has to be preserved unconditionally. They, on the contrary, declare inequality in itself as bad and merely contend that a lower degree of it is a lesser evil than a higher degree in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same sense in which a smaller quantity of poison in a man's body is a lesser evil than a larger dose. But if this is so, then there is logically in their doctrine no point at which the endeavors toward equalization would have to stop. It is just a matter of personal judgments of value, quite arbitrary, different with different people and changing in the passing of time, whether one has already reached a degree of inequality which is to be considered as low enough and beyond which it is not necessary to embark upon further measures toward equalization. As these champions of equalization appraise confiscation and "redistribution" as a policy harming only a minority, viz., those whom they consider to be "too" rich, and benefiting the rest — the majority — of the people, they cannot oppose any tenable argument to those who are asking for more of this allegedly beneficial policy. As long as any degree of inequality is left, there will always be people whom envy impels to press for a continuation of the equalization policy. Nothing can be advanced against their inference: If inequality of wealth and incomes is an evil, there is no reason to acquiesce in any degree of it, however low; equalization must not stop before it has completely leveled all individuals' wealth and incomes.

The history of the taxation of profits, incomes and estates in all countries clearly shows that once the principle of equalization is adopted, there is no point at which the further progress of the policy of equalization can be checked. If, at the time the Sixteenth Amendment was adopted, somebody had predicted that some years later the income tax progression would reach the height it has really attained in our day, the advocates of the Amendment would have called him a lunatic. It is certain that only a small minority in Congress will seriously oppose further sharpening of the progressive element in the tax rate scales if such a sharpening should be suggested by the Administration or by a congressman anxious to enhance his chances for re-election. For under the sway of the doctrines taught by contemporary pseudo-economists, but for a few reasonable men all people believe that they are injured by the mere fact that their own income is smaller than that of other people and that it is not a bad policy to confiscate this difference.

THERE IS no use in fooling ourselves. Our present taxation policy is headed toward a complete equalization of wealth and incomes and thereby toward socialism. This trend can be reversed only by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cognition of the role that profit and loss and the resulting inequality of wealth and incomes play in the operation of the market economy. People must learn that the accumulation of wealth by the successful conduct of business is the corollary of the improvement of their own standard of living and vice versa. They must realize that bigness in business is not an evil, but both the cause and effect of the fact that they themselves enjoy all those amenities whose enjoyment is called the "American way of life."

Ludwig von Mises is Visiting Professor of Economics at New York University.

THE FUNCTION OF THE ENTREPRENEUR

The real entrepreneur is a speculator, a man eager to utilize his opinion about the future structure of the market for business operations promising profits. This specific anticipative understanding of the conditions of the uncertain future defies any rules and systematization. It can be neither taught nor learned. If it were different, everybody could embark upon entrepreneurship with the same prospect of success. What distinguishes the successful enterpreneur and promoter from other people is precisely the fact that he does not let himself be guided by what was and is, but arranges his affairs on the ground of his opinion about the future. He sees the past and the present as other people do; but he judges the future in a different way. In his actions he is directed by an opinion about the future which deviates from those held by the crowd. . . . He trusts his own ability to understand future market conditions better than his less gifted fellow men.

The entrepreneurial function, the striving of entrepreneurs after profits, is the driving power in the market economy. Profit and loss are the devices by means of which the consumers exercise their supremacy on the market. The behavior of the consumers makes profits and losses appear and thereby shifts ownership of the means of production from the hands of the less efficient into those of the more efficient. It makes a man the more influential in the direction of business activities the better he succeeds in serving the consumers. In the absence of profit and loss the entrepreneurs would not know what the most urgent needs of the consumers are. If some entrepreneurs were to guess it, they would lack the means to adjust production accordingly.

Profit-seeking business is subject to the sovereignty of the consumers, while nonprofit institutions are sovereign unto themselves and not responsible to the public. Production for profit is necessarily production for use, as profits can only be earned by providing the consumers with those things they most urgently want to use. LUDWIG VON MISES, "Human Action"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

UNQUESTIONABLY, one of the most effective forms of communication is a thoughtful letter written to a person in answer to his own question.

The staff members of the Foundation for Economic Education write thousands of such letters each year. Some of these are, in effect, short articles on "general interest" subjects not fully covered in previous FEE publications.

A selection of these letters — slightly edited to eliminate extraneous references — will be published in this section from time to time.

Causes of Depressions

Dear Mr. H:

To help in answering your question about the causes of depressions, copies of several articles are being sent to you under separate cover. Perhaps the most extensive and thorough study of the subject has been made by Dr. Ludwig von Mises, and you will find a copy of one of his speeches, *Economic Planning*, in the package. If you are interested in pursuing this subject further, I would suggest that you take a look at his major work, *Human Action* (Yale University Press, 1949), especially Chapter XX, which deals with "Interest, Credit Expansion and the Trade Cycle." Meanwhile, I shall attempt a few brief words of explanation on this subject, myself.

All persons make mistakes from time to time. No person is omniscient. No one can foresee with absolute certainty new inventions or discoveries which will make past methods and products obsolete. Everyone may make mistakes in judgment. Probably many persons bought buggies, in the belief that the horseless carriage was just a passing fancy. An individual who buys a black-and-white television set today gambles on the possibility that color television will not become available commercially until he has received his "money's worth" from his purchase.

Businessmen make mistakes too. Because world conditions are ever-changing — are in a constant state of flux — businessmen must make decisions every day. And every decision results in action which may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be "right" or "wrong" from the businessman's point of view. Every step in the wrong direction is a crisis in the life of some particular individual. Under the conditions of a free market, where the law of supply and demand functions without interference, each worker, each businessman, learns very quickly if he has made a mistake. Each wrong guess hurts him — it causes him financial loss. Perhaps it may be a minor mistake, soon rectified. But, however minor, he finds it expensive, and he tries to correct it as soon as possible. Every day, millions of daily crises occur in the lives of millions of persons. Unless something happens to interfere with their estimates as to the future or to upset the plans of these millions of people, they each tend to counteract and correct their individual errors, if possible, before they develop into serious crises, so that, unfortunate as these mistakes may be for the persons involved, the ups and downs of business are soon remedied.

You will say you have heard all this before — that this doesn't answer your question about the "Great Depression" of 1929 to 1932 plus! I remember how astonished I was when I started studying these matters several years ago to learn that the stock market boom of the 1920's, the crash, and the depression were NOT due to the failures of businessmen, but to the interference, *by government*, with the mechanism outlined above.

All through the 1920's the federal government, through the Federal Reserve Banks, was controlling the interest rate. (And the Federal Reserve Banks control interest rates in this country today.) The men who were making these decisions in the 1920's were just as liable to error as any other human being. They were not omniscient supermen. The principal mistake they made was due to a perfectly logical situation. They wanted to keep the government interest payment low — they wanted to help out the poor Europeans who had suffered in the war (World War I) — and they wanted people, the voters, in this country to feel prosperous, to have plenty of money to spend, so that they would send the politicians-in-power back to office. (And the voters did just this in 1924, and again in 1928.)

Under the influence of their politically-appointed Board of Governors, the Federal Reserve Banks lowered the rate of interest during the 1920's below the *market* rate, i.e., they lowered it below what it would have been if they hadn't intervened, so that people wanted to borrow more at the new low rate than they would have at the *market* rate of interest. Demand for credit increased.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In order to meet the demand without raising the rate of interest, the Federal Reserve Banks, with the aid of government, created money and/or credit artificially. (In a free market, no one can borrow money unless someone else has accumulated savings. But when it is possible to loan money or grant credit from a newly created supply of money or credit, the amount people can borrow is no longer limited by the amount other people have saved.) The fact that money was comparatively cheap to borrow in the 1920's created the impression that there were more capital goods and factors of production available for expanding production than there actually were. The businessmen made their plans as if the available credit and money were an indication of the amount of savings which had been accumulated, whereas in fact, the only difference was that the supply of money and credit had been increased. The businessmen were making their calculations on the basis of a rate of interest which was not the *market* rate — their calculations were founded on falsified information.

People in the 1920's, pleased at the comparative cheapness of borrowing, borrowed more money than they would have if it had been more expensive. Some used this money to bid up stock market prices — others to buy things on the installment plan. Some businessmen used this money to plan additions to their factories and others to start big real estate developments, etc. Because people had more money, while the supply of goods that they were trying to buy with the money was the same — they bid the prices of goods up, and up, and up. As businessmen found that their plans for expansion were going to cost more than they had anticipated, due to the increase in prices, they borrowed still more money from the banks. And so the spiral of easy money bidding up prices made it necessary for the banks to create still more money and credit. Although the banks *did* increase the interest rate somewhat for the loans they made in the 1920's, the rate was still below the *market* rate — it was still cheaper than it would have been, in view of the increased supply of money and credit, if the banks and the government had not intervened.

But one day some individuals or banks who had money out on loan began to have doubts and they decided to call their loans. And then the troubles started. The doubts were cumulative. Everybody started scrambling to save something from his own business.

Perhaps, you will say, these people who borrowed too much were just individuals who made mis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

takes, and that is what happens every time anyone loses money, or makes an error in his anticipation of business conditions. But, normally, if one man makes his plans on the basis of an error in judgment, there is another — perhaps his next door neighbor — who plans more correctly in the light of the way things turn out, so that the net effect is that the right estimates and the mistakes in judgments balance out. When almost everybody makes an error in his anticipation of future events, and the errors are almost all wrong in the same direction, there must be a reason. And the reason in 1929 was that the use of money was cheap compared with other things on the market. And the reason the use of money was cheap was because there were regulations that made it cheap. The blame for the Great Depression should be laid, NOT at the feet of the free market economy, but at the door of governmental intervention.

In 1929, there was a depression when the easy money policy of the 1920's finally came to an end, as all monetary and credit inflations eventually must. In Germany there was a run-away inflation and a complete breakdown of the monetary system in 1923, because the government allowed the inflationary monetary policy to continue. (Although the interest rate in Germany reached 90% in 1923, in view of the inflation it would probably have been several hundred per cent if it had not been suppressed artificially below the market rate!)

When governments interfere to control and regulate the economy in any way, the price of the intervention must be paid sooner or later. Interference with the monetary system is especially vicious because it affects everything in the economy, and also because it is so complicated and difficult to explain that its effects, more often than not, are blamed on other than their true causes. (As you know, business has long borne the blame for the depression of the 1920's.) If the true causes of the Great Depression of 1929 were more generally known, there would be less eagerness for us to follow the same governmental policies today that were practiced in the 1920's.

The answer to the world's problems cannot lie in one single plan, nor in fifty nor a hundred plans, subject to the whims of vote-seeking politicians and fallible human beings. The answer to the world's problems lies in hundreds of millions of plans, each plan made by one individual working for himself and his family. In order to supply his own needs, he must seek to satisfy the wishes of the consumers who are in the market for his product, or for his labor. And so, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working "selfishly" for himself and his family, he cannot help but contribute to the "general welfare." The man who succeeds in pleasing the greatest number of consumers, receives their dollar "votes," and thus acquires the means to expand his business and the opportunity to try to please more consumers; or the chance to purchase the production of others; or to make gifts to his favorite charities.

Among the books which have been written on this subject, *The Great Depression* by Lionel Robbins (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1935), and *Economics and the Public Welfare* (D. Van Nostrand Co., New York, 1949) by B. M. Anderson, are especially worth-while. BETTINA BIEN

Bettina Bien is a member of the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education.

What Determines Prices?

Dear Mr. B:

To answer your question about the source of prices is not as simple as it might appear. Perhaps the best way to start is with a brief review of history.

Back in the 18th century, when folks were beginning to crystallize the various ideas about prices, values, costs, and economic matters, Adam Smith, among others, began to search for the reason why goods had certain prices. He realized that a loaf of bread had a price that was, more or less, related to the labor that went into it. And he saw that a pair of shoes had another price, which was also, more or less, connected with the amount of work involved. The conclusion that he came to was that the price at which a product sells is the sum total of the wages and costs that go into its preparation. This was called the "labor theory of value." Later this idea was adopted by Marx and adapted to his ideas.

As people pondered these matters more and more, a few of these early thinkers soon began to realize that an object's value was related not only to the work involved, as Adam Smith concluded, but also to its utility. But they ran up against what has been called "the paradox of value," for they could not explain why a pound of iron, for instance, which has many uses, was worth less than a pound of gold. It took many years for the "marginal utility (subjective) theory of value" to be developed. It was not until after 1870, that this idea began to be clarified. In simple terms this theory means that a hungry man will be willing to pay more for his first meal after a fast, for he gets more "utility" out of it, than he will want to offer at that time for a second, or third meal.

Very briefly, this is the evolution of the theory of value. Today it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognized that value is not intrinsic, it is not in things. The value of an object depends on the utility of the services expected. In other words, it is *subjective,* not *objective.*

A potential purchaser weighs the price of each object he considers buying against the value it has for him personally. Should it be priced higher than he wants to pay, he need not buy it — he may look for a substitute, or go without. The result is that producers and sellers do not always succeed in recouping their costs. The price at which an object is sold on the market is determined by thousands and thousands of individual (subjective) value judgments of purchasers and potential purchasers, not by the costs involved.

But this does not mean that the cost of production is not an important factor. Production is discouraged if producers believe that the final consumer will not be willing to pay a high enough price to cover the sum total of his anticipated costs. A producer who guesses well may make a high profit. But if other producers catch on, and start making the same thing, or providing the same service, the demand for the particular type of material or labor required, or for an extra supply of capital, may force up the costs so that they will be above the price the consumer is willing to pay. Producers who don't guess quite well enough will not make their costs, or will have to cut their margin of profit. Producers who have high costs may be forced out of the business entirely, leaving the field to the more efficient who can produce to sell at a price consumers are willing to pay.

And so back to your original question. We see that those early thinkers who pondered the ideas of Adam Smith were on the right track when they started asking questions about the "utility," the end use, i.e., the subjective value of a commodity. In the final analysis it is the consumers who actually determine the prices at which goods are sold. The producers and distributors are helpless in the hands of "King Consumer."

BETTINA BIEN

Competition

Gentlemen:

We believe that the work being done by the Foundation for Economic Education is very worthwhile and deserves our support. However, we are concerned about the apparent duplication of effort in other organizations. Would it not be both more effective and more efficient to combine into one large organization the various smaller groups which appear to have similar purposes? B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dear Mr. B:

Your concern raises two fundamental questions:

1. To what extent is there duplication of effort?
2. At what point is duplication of effort harmful?

With reference to the first question, I think that many organizations in our field share the same broad objective: to create a wider understanding of liberty and the free market. But that situation is not vitally different from the similarity of objectives in the manufacture of machinery. When each manufacturer sets out to build the most effective machine for a specific purpose, there is bound to be duplication of effort. However, as manufacturers begin to specialize, use different methods, and serve different groups, the extent of duplication is minimized.

In a general way, the same thing holds true in educational effort. We all agree on the overall objective but we differ in editorial content; in the approach to the problem; in directing our effort to various audiences; and in the manner in which we present our findings.

The second question opens up an interesting area of thought. Of course, there is a certain amount of duplication in all fields of endeavor, but is this harmful? If it is, at what point does it become wasteful?

Duplication of effort is necessary if there is to be competition and progress. For instance, take the search for a cure for cancer. Would it be feasible to select just one man or one group of men to do the research? We could certainly concentrate our resources in this group but by preventing the activity of others, we might not discover the cure.

Duplication of effort can be reduced by three means:

1. *The use of force.* I think it is generally agreed that this method is subject to abuse.
2. *Cooperative effort.* How would this be done? Would you merge all the organizations, the good and bad, the competent and the incompetent? Would this not entail compromise? Would not the most effective organization be weakened by such a merger?
3. *By competition.* We preach the benefits of competition and we believe in it even in this field. Furthermore, I think that you and others who are called upon to support these institutions should want competition maintained for this reason: Perhaps one of these organizations will show enough gumption, ingenu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity and understanding to make some headway. And if I were you or anyone among the potential supporters, I would put my money on the horse that looks best. That is the only justifiable way I know to weed out the ineffective duplication of effort.

Our task, as we see it, is to seek answers to economic questions and to develop explanations for liberty in a nation where it has been taken for granted so long that it is gradually being taken away. We attempt to supply individuals in all parts of the country — those who can't spend much time doing the drudgery which is research — with facts and ideas. Our goal is to help those who want to understand liberty — to serve as a catalyst to the independent thinking of those who realize the importance of finding answers to economic problems — to the end that liberty and economics may be understood by many persons and in this way aid in the recovery of our freedom.

The Foundation bids for your support, of course. But we should receive it on no other basis than your conviction that our work merits it.

Enclosed is a pamphlet which attempts to brief the answers to pertinent questions about our institution. Also enclosed is a Donor Form, should you care to use it.

WILLIAM JOHNSON

Dear Mr. Johnson:

"This donation is better evidence than any words, that your letter was effective." B.

William Johnson, Editor of FAITH AND FREEDOM *was formerly a member of the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education.*

Guaranteed Annual Wage

Since most industries lack the reserves to pay employees a year's income in advance, it follows that industry cannot guarantee an annual wage unless industry is first guaranteed a market for its products.

Are the sponsors of a guaranteed annual wage ready to sponsor guaranteed annual sales? Probably not. For, were they to be logical and do the latter, the absurdity of the former would be obvious. WILLIAM R. CLARK

Have you heard the story about the fishing industry agitating for a guaranteed annual catch? MARSHALL OLDS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Attributed to George Washington
during the Constitutional Convention

The Foundation for Economic Education, while nonprofit and nonpolitical, is nonetheless an educational champion of private ownership, the profit and loss system, and limited government. Its studies in economics, political science, and related subjects are available to all. It is responsible to no outside person or group. It is supported only by voluntary donations and the sale of its publications. Additional information on request.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED